

NO LIBERTY WITHOUT LAW

The following series, of which this is the first part, was originally produced and published some 20 years ago by "The Federation of the Covenant People", of Johannesburg South Africa, an organisation which to the best of our knowledge, no longer exists. It is such an excellent work that we have decided to reprint the series in their entirety (originally in THE COVENANT VISION) for the benefit, instruction and enjoyment of our many readers. The author is not known, but was presumably the late Dr. Finlay.

INTRODUCTION TO

'No Liberty Without Law'

There is a growing awareness among the company of nations generally designated as the Anglo-CeltoSaxon and Kindred people that politics as practised today and political reality are poles apart. This awareness has taken into account the fact that the West is without sophisticated leadership and consequently, lacks directive in the context of survival. This company of nations which gave birth to Twentieth Century civilisation and all the amenities attendant with this, is, by current pressures from within and without, giving birth to a new era which is the very antithesis of that which dawned at the beginning of this century. It is to be an era governed by the grandiose terminology of 'human liberty' which presupposes that all men are equal and have equality in perception concerning the definition of English words. In other words, this new age is to be one in which 'each man shall do those things which are right in his own eyes' irrespective of whether or not his neighbour holds a similar definition. When shorn of its verbose terminology, this new era of permissiveness is nothing less than a part and parcel of the grand design which is aimed at the elimination of the custodians of law and order and the total eradication of God and His Plan and Purpose for the world.

It is, by the very nature of present developments within the grand design, unacceptable to equate God with world politics and yet, when one considers the Old Testament record, one finds that men, living much closer to God than the present generation, did not hesitate to bring Him into the politics of the day and to follow His Directives as this formed the national Constitution of the day. To them, He was not the One-Day-A-Week-God Whose relevance became apparent during religious services - He was an integral part of their national whole Whose Laws prospered the people until they, just as today, felt that they had progressed beyond the scope of His Commandments.

It is the purpose of this series to provide a history of God's Law as this was given to His Covenant People and to show that while some four millenia have passed since they were codified at Sinai and given to Israel, their validity remains no matter how sophisticated one may consider the present time. During the course of this series it will be seen that the prescribed alternatives to obedience to God's Law is still operative and that in Britain alone, some eight years ago, the alternatives recorded in Deuteronomy 28:15-44, became the national experience - not by accident, but as a reminder of the continuing validity of the Law of the Lord.

God's Law - a Political Instrument

But what is liberty without wisdom, and without virtue? It is the greatest of all possible evils, - for it is folly, vice, and madness, without tuition or restraints (Burke - Reflections on the Revolution in France)

It has been claimed that, from a politically evolutionary point of view, the present age was begun during the period of the French Revolution under the battle-cry of 'Liberty - Equality - Fraternity'. Such was the conviction - or persuasion - of that time that on September 21, 1792, members of the Convention believed that they were fully justified in dating that 'moment' as Year One in the calendar of human achievement. One should be under no delusion here no matter how much one may resent the implied irrelevance of the Birth of the Lord Jesus Christ and the Dawn of the Christian era as Year One. The French Revolution was a new starting point of political achievement, the ripples of which have persisted for almost two centuries and today show every indication of intensifying the erroneous premise on which it was built. None will surely deny that one of the most vicious of modern plagues is that of the violent overthrow of Constitutional Government by revolutionary means and none will surely attempt to refute the French Revolutionary basis for it.

Since the latter end of the eighteenth Century and using the clause, 'the rights of man' embodied in the French Constitution since August 26, 1789, sinister and self-seeking elements have waved the flag of liberty around the world without any reference to responsibility without which, liberty becomes licence. That this was so at the close of the First World War was clearly evident in academic circles for in a speech at the University of Wisconsin in 1918, Otto Khan made the following observation. "As so often before, liberty has been wounded in the house of its friends. Liberty in the wild and freakish hands of fanatics has once more, as frequently in the past, proved the effective helpmate of autocracy and the twin-brother of tyranny ... The deadliest foe of democracy is not autocracy, but liberty frenzied. Liberty is not foolproof. For its beneficent working it demands selfrestraint, a sane and clear recognition of the practical and attainable, and of the fact that there are laws of nature which are beyond our power to change,"

Men have, through the persuasion of ideological beliefs, attempted to change nature by endowing all men with an equal perception of the words 'Equality, Liberty and Fraternity' ignoring the fact that it was a rabble-rousing cliché devoid of political reality. Under this, the manipulators of the French Revolution disposed of all authority from the Emperor to the clergy hoping to extend this throughout all Europe, thus establishing republican rather than Monarchial Government. It is a matter of history that it failed then but this is not to say that the same objectives do not obtain today.

With the toppling of the Tsarist regime in Russia in 1917 - and under the identical pretext which energised the French Revolution barely a century earlier, the Bolshevik Revolution set a machinery in motion which claimed as its motive the emancipation of man under the liberty of world socialism. As with the French Revolution, the ideal had many advocates and in Britain, the home of law and order, one found the United Socialist Council calling for a national Conference at Leeds to "Hail the Russian Revolution - To Organise the British Democracy - To follow Russia". Such was the fanaticism of the 'revolution for liberty' that even philosophers, usually given to supporting new and outwardly progressive ideas, found it necessary to issue a warning against the developing trends. They contended that while it was admitted that Nature had not made men slaves, but free with an intrinsic right to liberty, this

right did not extend to infringing the equal freedom of others. There was indeed the 'voice of reason' at that time a reason which soon vapourised when the world depression of the 30's struck to be followed by the Second World War. Reason had no place in the holocaust of destruction which swept across the world and as a shaken humanity began to take stock of their affairs, the 'wise' began to see that 'liberty' was a commodity manipulated by the 'powers of darkness' for their own ends. However, although being wise to the implications, they could do nothing to halt the revolutionary tide.

The post-war era saw an artificial intensification of the principle of the emancipation of man. It witnessed the dismantling of colonialism, the disintegration of imperialism as exemplified by the British Empire and the emergence of the so-called Third World as a political power. All this was achieved under the pretext of liberty - the freeing of the oppressed and the granting of dignity to those subservient to the administration of others. However, over the past 45 years, history has shown that universal liberty is merely an idealistic excuse to cover universal licence. Events are repeating themselves, for over the long period of the seven thousand years of recorded human history men have shown by their actions that they refuse to extend their own right of liberty to others and have imposed their arbitrary wills upon their neighbour. Liberty has indeed been seen as licence and in consequence, chapter after chapter of confusion has been written into the record of human endeavour leaving a legacy of tyranny, conquest, lawlessness, oppression and mob-rule to future generations. This is precisely what has crystallised into the experience of the present generation which finds itself conditioned to accepting that liberty is really licence and licence really liberty.

The Main Target of Lawlessness

Reference has already been made to the United Socialist Council in Britain with its support for the Bolshevik Revolution. However, forces dedicated to the erosion of the British Empire and the exploitation of world revolutionary trend were already at work as early as 1911. The Socialist Party of Great Britain (S.P.G.B.) had, by that time, issued a pamphlet which, in effect, was a declaration of war against Christian Britain of that time. This pamphlet, under the title of Socialism and Religion, makes the following statements:-

- "It is therefore a profound truth that Socialism is the natural enemy of religion."
- "A Christian Socialist is in fact an anti-Socialist."
- "The most absurd claim of all is that Christ was a Socialist. Christ's denunciation of wealth is not Socialism. 'Sell what thou hast and give to the poor' was His advice to a rich man. This is not Socialism, but anarchism and social suicide, for the wholesale distribution of alms is a 'remedy more deadly than any disease'. Socialism, on the contrary, is the appreciation of the things of this world and the endeavour to make a Paradise here."
- "Christianity is the very antithesis of Socialism."

In her incredibly informative work *The Surrender of an Empire*, Nesta Webster documents the evidence of coercion and betrayal which led ultimately to the complete disintegration of the British Empire - a disintegration which has been accomplished by a two-pronged attack which went beyond the island home and thrust itself into every Anglo-Saxon nation on the earth. This attack dealt a fearful blow against the faith of the people by ridiculing 'the faith of our fathers' and then drove this home by putting up candidates for election to Government whose loyalties were centred in political ideology rather than patriotic realities. Slowly but surely, Britain's national way of life underwent a change until today her political thinking is

chained to the ideal of liberty for all men - regardless of the fact that the very liberty which she is bestowing is being used to obliterate her from the face of the earth.

Why is this so? Why is it that the whole body of Anglo-Saxon nations throughout the earth has been subjected to and, like Britain, is capitulating to the erroneous concept that the so-called liberated nations are equally altruistic in permitting the same liberty of self-determination in Anglo-Saxondom? The very powers of hell have been unleashed on this company of nations and as one looks back over the history of these people for the past four hundred years, one is able to discern the point in human experience where politics and religion merge into a tangible demonstration of the reality of God. Was it purely coincidental that the beginning of the 17th Century was marked by an opening of God's Word to the people? Was it a further coincidence that the people who embraced the Book, both nationally and individually, soon developed on the stage of world history at the precise time and in the exact manner as God had prescribed for His People? The fact of the matter is that Anglo-Saxondom is not only the People of the Book - their history proves that they are the People in the Book. They are indeed God's Witness Nation (Isaiah 43:12,21). In this role, it naturally follows that they would be the target of all anti-God forces and as is evidenced today, the pattern of erosion has been centred on everything which witnesses to the Hand of God in these people.

Liberty from Law

It is one of the most amazing wonders of the age that the Anglo-Saxon people allowed themselves to be hood-winked into believing that the religious liberty which had derived from the Reformation had extended to their handling of the things of God. Ignoring the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ said: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18), or as recorded by Luke: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke 16:17), individuals within Anglo-Saxondom allowed themselves the luxury of religion without responsibility. Instead of 'searching the Scriptures' they allowed their whole appreciation of the Biblical narrative to be guided according to the theology of the Reformers who, let's face it, were not infallible. Martin Luther was, of course, a violent antinomianist i.e., he was opposed to the Law of the Lord as having any place in the Christian experience. On August 1, 1521, he wrote to Melanchthon, a co-worker in the Reformation stating: "Sin cannot separate us from God, even if we commit murder and fornication a thousand times a day". 'Sin' of course, is the transgression of God's Law (1 John 3:4) and from what Luther wrote, it was obvious that he visualised a Christian life without any discipline or responsibility.

Melanchthon, on the other hand, responded by writing a treatise of confusion in which he attempted to persuade his disciples that the Law of Moses, having become redundant, had now been superseded by natural law or the law of the human conscience. In *Loci Communes* he wrote: "Some laws are natural laws, others divine, and others human. Concerning natural laws, I have seen nothing worthily written either by theologians or lawyers. For when natural laws are being proclaimed, it is proper that their formulas be collected by the method of human reason through the natural syllogism. I have not yet seen this done by anyone, and I do not know at all whether it can be done, since human reason is so enslaved and blinded - at least it has been up until now. Moreover, Paul teaches in Romans 2:15 in a remarkably fine and clear argument that there is in the Gentiles a conscience which either defends or accuses their acts, and therefore it is law. For what is conscience but a judgment of our deeds which is derived from some law or common rule? The law of nature, therefore, is a common judgment

to which all men give the same consent. This law which God has engraved on the mind of each is suitable for the shaping of morals.” Here indeed is liberty of the wrong kind for the human conscience, as has been demonstrated by the Roman doctrine of ‘Confession’ and penances for the remission of transgressions surely indicates that the conscience is easily appeased by pretensions of piety. Thus believing that any act, within the frame-work of an easily appeasable conscience, was valid as Christian behaviour, Anglo-Saxondom ignored the Statutes and Commandments in the Law of the Lord and unbeknown to them, experienced the Judgments in both the national and individual spheres. However, not all Anglo-Saxons accepted the theology of the Reformers and there arose a faction which became known as the Puritans whose doctrine, whatever may have developed later, centred on the discipline of God’s Law. To many, this was a harsh sect which held the view that it was the business of the state to supervise the personal morality of its citizens and which, in the light of the new religious liberalism endowed by Martin Luther and others, was totally incompatible with what was now conceived as Christian behaviour.

Liberty That Was Not

While Anglo-Saxondom broke with Rome, the new independent Church of England still retained some of the superstitions and corrupt observances which characterised the Papal Church. The more advanced among the Protestant clergy sought to make the break complete and it was from this endeavour that the Puritans sprang. Life, under this dedication became a burden and many decided to leave England and settled in Holland where a Puritan Church was established at Leyden. However, after 10 years, this little company found the Continental religious liberty an abused privilege and it was decided to ‘leave for another land’. Obtaining from the Virginia Company a grant of land in the new world and having received an assurance of their freedom to worship as they pleased from the king through Sir Edwin Sandys, they returned to England and finally sailed from Plymouth on September 6, 1620.

Adverse weather caused this little band of 102 men, women and children to land on the coast of Massachusetts far north of the territory allotted to them and on December 21, 1620, they founded the Plymouth Colony with deep reverence. In the stuffy little cabin of the Mayflower these men drew up a Compact which recorded the following declaration of intent.

“In the Name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten, having undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith, a voyage to plant the first colony . . . do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God, combine ourselves into a civil body politic.”

Here was the drafting of future political intent which these men did not hesitate to marry to their religious convictions.

In the historical records of the Colony dating from 1638 to 1649 one is able to see the Hand of God working for one finds such entries in official documents as to indicate the embracing of the Law of God as the Constitution for the people.

“March 2, 1641-42: And according to the fundamental agreement, made and published by full and general consent, when the plantation began and government was settled, that the judicial Law of God given by Moses and expounded in other parts of Scripture, so far as it is a hedge and a fence to the moral law, and neither ceremonial nor typical nor had any

reference to Canaan, hath an everlasting equity in it, and should be the rule of their proceedings . . .”

“April 3, 1644: It was ordered that the judicial Laws of God, as they were delivered by Moses . . . be a rule to all the courts in this jurisdiction in their proceedings against all offenders . . .” Changes soon manifest themselves, however. To the original colony of 102 were added unrecorded numbers of families who fled from the Old to the New England in the west - an emigration which was checked in 1631 when conditions in England took a change for the better in the struggle between the king and the people. However, by 1640 it was said of the little colony of Pennsylvania just south of Massachusetts, that one could hear every language in Europe spoken. Franklin, in 1751, estimated that there were “near a million English souls” in the colonies while the first census taken in 1790 ascertained that the overall population was 3,929,214 persons. If Franklin was correct, the proportion of English immigrants to others was roughly one quarter.

Such was the popularity of the New World that the British Crown created what is known as ‘charter colonies’ which were centred in Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island. In these the colonial governments had charters from the Crown, giving the people, or freemen, the right to choose their own governors and other magistrates, to make their own laws and enforce them. As has been stated previously, Massachusetts, having been established by the Puritans from the Mayflower, had already resorted to the Law of the Lord as the governing Instrument and although it is not recorded when this ceased to be the rule of conduct, what is known is that the right of selfadministration was removed from them in 1684. While Connecticut and Rhode Island kept their charters intact, the Massachusetts charter was cancelled by the Crown judges with a new charter issued in 1691.

Under this the appointment of the governor was reserved to the Crown - a governor who had the right of absolute veto on all laws operative within the colony. From this, one should not imagine that England was the ‘baddy’ in the drama of the new world, far from it. While there were both good and bad governors appointed, one is able to see, from records still available, that among them were God-fearing and knowledgeable men. In 1775, just one year before American Independence, Jonathan Trumbull, the English governor of the colony of Connecticut, appointed November 16 as a Day of Public Thanksgiving. In his proclamation, he enjoined all to “. . . offer up humble and earnest Prayers to God for our Sovereign Lord King George the Third; our gracious Queen Charlotte; His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and the Rest of the Royal Family: That God would inspire the King’s Heart with Wisdom to discern the true interests of all his people; guide and dispose him such measures as may happily tend to their peace, prosperity and happiness: That He would bless our Civil rulers; lead them into the most wise and prudent measures, happily to guide our affairs in this dark and difficult day; ***and make them know what Israel ought to do.*** That he would graciously restore the blessings He has given us a right to enjoy and preserve our privileges forever”.

The opportunity afforded by the Lord God of Israel in the New World to demonstrate the practical nature of His Law as a National Constitution was impeded by the in-flow of immigrants to whom the Constitution was never given and to whom it meant nothing. Democracy was established - a form of rule which is totally alien to the Constitution provided by Almighty God. The first occasion when God’s People lapsed into a primitive form of democracy was when in the absence of Moses on the mount, Aaron was induced to create a golden calf as the object of Israel’s service and worship. The voice of the ‘mixed multitude’

accompanying Israel in the Exodus, was loudest - the mob indeed ruled the nation then - and rules today.

At present, government throughout all the Anglo-Saxon nations is the same. No thought of what God has done in history to remind His People that He is Faithful is given, nor do the political leaders ever examine their administrative mechanisms against what God intended for His People. *“Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God hath commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations . . .”* (Deuteronomy 4:5-6). Statutes and Judgments - these are National matters vitally important to the organisation of government which God assures is the yardstick - indeed the only yard-stick - for the operation of His People in the earth.

The ‘tares’ (see the parable in Matthew 13:24-30) have indeed been planted in the midst of the Kingdom ‘wheat’ and at the moment are choking the nature, character and purpose of it. However, having irrevocably committed His People to the accomplishment of His world national purposes, the Lord’s Will must be done on earth. If, however, the Anglo-Saxon people of the world refuse, through self-blindness and world propaganda, to allow God’s Will to be done through them, make no mistake, it will be done to them. The chastisement - prescribed in God’s Law - is already taking its toll throughout all Anglo-Saxon lands as a reminder of the political reality of the need to get back to the principles of ‘life and good, death and evil’ (Deuteronomy 30:15). Paradoxically, hell-bent as the Anglo-Saxon company of nations are to sponsor the cry for ‘equality, liberty and fraternity’, they have chosen ‘death and evil’, whereas in their very hands - nay, written in their heart and minds - is the Law of the Lord - ‘life and good’. It is surely time that God’s People knew what they must do - and do it.

“Just laws are no restraint upon the freedom of the good, for the good man desires nothing which a just law will interfere with.” Froude - Short studies on Great Subjects.

It has been said and generally accepted that the Renaissance was the process whereby Europe passed from a medieval to a modern civilisation - the French word itself indicating rebirth (re: *again*; naitre: *to be born*). This period is acclaimed as ‘the revival of learning’ and while the Reformation cannot be described as a direct consequence of the Renaissance - this writer believes the Reformation to have been the specific Action of God in vindication of His Word of Promise - the new spirit of limitless enquiry and the passion for accuracy and truth undoubtedly contributed to the rejection of Papal superstitions and practices.

As has been stated previously, this era was utilised by God to demonstrate His Truth to the people whom He had constituted as His witnesses (Isaiah 43:10,21). The New England band of Puritans, although eventually undermined by the weight of political opposition from the numerically superior immigrants from Europe, put the Law of the Lord into operation as the governing instrument in the civil body politic. Subsequent to this, there followed the demonstration of God’s Faithfulness to the Covenant which He made with the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in that, centred in Britain, history had recorded the development of a national instrument along lines which God had assured would be those of His true Israel people. It was indeed an era for the exploitation of Truth but, as has been demonstrated throughout man’s recorded history, Truth is unpalatable to the majority who prefer its opposite - error.

To counter the microscopic demonstration of the efficacy of the Law of the Lord as implemented in New England, men began to formulate policies based on the humanistic concept which made no provision for God's Directives. With the wealth of Scriptural exhortations concerning political economy now available through the Open Book and particularly in view of the religious fervour which gripped the people because of the Reformation, one would have thought that this would have been the basis for any new policy contemplated. Tragically, the policy-makers turned their back on God's Word and embraced the work by Adam Smith - The Wealth of Nations - which appeared in 1776 and became the very antithesis of the political economy in the Law of the Lord. Ignoring the lesson of Genesis 2 which records God's opposition to the same political economy as propounded by Adam Smith, men persisted in forcing God out of politics and allowing Him credence on one day of the week and then only within the walls of man-made structures called a church.

Even within the mighty edifices of majestic buildings adorned with religious ensignia and permeated with an atmosphere of religious piety, God was not allowed to be Himself, but was made to conform to the Image which man has bestowed on Him. It was within these walls that He had to listen to expositions which claimed that He, the Jehovah or Lord of the Old Testament was a superstitious invention of some desert tribes which, in keeping with primitive practices of that time, conjured up a deity which was appropriate for the needs of the people during those early years. While it is certainly not denied that people have and do create gods, these gods are usually very agreeable to what the people wish and usually direct what the people desire. For example, if the people want a permissive society, they create a permissive god who not only condones lawlessness, but actually encourages it and provides religious sanction to those who indulge in it. What men have failed to see is that the God of the Old Testament does not fall into the category of created gods. If Jehovah was the product of nomadic tribes as is suggested by modern teachers, His Creation was different to anything which had preceded or succeeded it. He was certainly not agreeable to the wishes of the people and His Laws were contrary to their desires.

This is precisely why the God of the Old Testament is rejected today for what He had declared by way of Covenant, what He demands by way of obedience and what He requires as Service are totally incompatible with the desires of modern men. They prefer to have a God Who makes no demands upon them other than those which are convenient to them and their preference for a God of antinomianism - lawlessness - is very evident in the opposition to any suggestion that men need His Law today. Nothing is more deadly or derelict than the religious concept within Anglo-Saxondom that the Christian, whether individual or nation, has the right of conduct governed exclusively by the human conscience. This antinomianism, promulgated by Agricola, Luther and other European reformists is at variance with God's Word which was first directed through the prophets and latterly through His Son and none other (Hebrews 1:1-2).

The Lord Jesus Christ said: "*It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail*" (Luke 16:17) while others, infinitely less authoritative, contend and positively assert the human conscience as the only yard-stick for religious or political behaviour.

The Christian and the Law

It is quite common today to hear countless assertions, despite the categorical statement by the Lord, that, as the Law 'had no power to change a sinful heart', it had to be put aside as an instrument unnecessary to the Christian experience. The 19th Psalm gives the lie to this for it

is stated: "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul . . ." - an active mechanism which achieves infinitely more than the puny verbal efforts of men. Then again one hears that 'the fiery finger of God's Law points unerringly to Jesus Christ the Lord Who fulfilled every jot and tittle of it and having thus fulfilled the Law, bowed His Head on Calvary's cross and cried that heaven and earth, angel and sinner might hear; It is finished'. Make no mistake here. It was not the Law which was finished, but the machinery of Redemption which formerly had been limited to sacrificial ordinances of shed blood of bulls and goats. A brief consideration of the history of the Law will confirm this.

The Bible narrative opens with a comparatively brief summary of the great Act of Creation and while Law, as such, is not mentioned, one is confronted by an order of perfection which men have called the immutable laws of nature. The continuity of each form of life was governed by the natural act of adhering each to 'its kind' - a primitive form of separate development or natural law. There can thus be no doubt whatsoever that Law was present at Creation and while men are content to equate this as the 'laws of nature' - a self creating accommodation with varying environments - they fail to appreciate that there is no law in nature, there is a law *over* nature - God's Law.

While man (Hebrew *aw dawm*; ruddy or able to blush) was given 'dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth' (Genesis 1:28), the process by which this dominion was to be accomplished is not given. The first intimation of Law, as such, appears in Genesis 2:16 when 'the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it . . .' This command thus became the law of life to Adam who was endowed with the right of choice and the Power to choose 'life and good; death and evil'.

It is patently obvious, however, that much more was involved in the 'Command' of the Lord God, for while the narrative merely recounts the above quoted bald statement, subsequent events such as the banishment of Cain and the Flood were judgments which could only be enacted against some specific commandment. Sin, or law transgression, cannot be imputed when there is no law and in consequence no judgment can be passed, nor punishment enacted unless there has been a violation of the rule of conduct which had been communicated to those involved. Meagre though the information is, such as is available suggests that the Adamic family, in its infancy, was acquainted with more of God's Word than is currently recorded in the Bible. In Hebrews 11:4 it is written that "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts". Abel's offering was 'by faith' which is 'by report, but the report by the word of God' (literal translation Romans 10:17), thus indicating that Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel were conversant with the 'report' of the word of God in the context of sacrifice. Further to this, it is stated that Abel 'obtained witness that he was righteous' - the word 'righteous' being translated from the Greek *dikaio*s from the root *dike* which means 'right' in terms of justice and which, in turn, pre-supposes a body of revealed law.

In connection with the Flood, the same feature is again in evidence for while it is stated: "And God saw that the wickedness of man (Hebrew *aw dawm*) was great in the earth and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Genesis 6:5), Peter draws attention to Noah whom he cites as a 'preacher of righteousness'. The word 'righteousness' in the Greek text, as with that in connection with Abel's sacrifice, is *dikaio*s which, as has been stated above, has connection with a body of revealed law. It is therefore

apparent that the antediluvian civilisation of the Adamic family devolved into a permissive society in which, as with today, men were a law unto themselves pursuing a life which centred in self-gratification. The fact that 'violence' filled the earth is another indication of the existence of law, for according to rabinnical authorities, the Hebrew *chamac* - translated 'violence' - indicates the gross outrage of the rights of the weak by the strong - 'rights' being derived from a body of law bestowing these. Be that as it may, judgment was certainly visited on that generation - a judgment which would only be righteous if the people had violated prescribed law.

The Law and Man

While there is evidence of the existence of law in the antediluvian civilisation, the first positive statement regarding human administration as such appears in the immediate postdiluvian era where the mandate for human government was given. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Genesis 9:6). This immediately raises the point that while men undoubtedly knew the law, apart from the basic cause and effect principle, the law could not and did not enforce itself. This being so, it became necessary to delegate to the Noachic family the right of administration and judgment in the organisation of society.

The error into which so many fall when postulating the theory of the termination of the Law on Calvary's cross, is that they fail to note that the Law did not begin at Sinai. There is ample scriptural evidence to prove that the Laws of God were not only in operation, but actually kept four hundred years prior to the codification of these Laws at Sinai. Abraham, who lived some four centuries prior to the Mosaic Dispensation, obeyed, not the laws of men, nor those evolved by the developing situation of that time, but the laws of God. This information was provided to Isaac by the Lord Who stated that His Covenant Commitment was "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Genesis 26:5). It is thus a scriptural fact that Abraham observed God's Law long before Moses was born. It is not stated however, that Abraham observed any prescribed ritual which made atonement for transgression of God's Laws, thus making it patently obvious that no such ordinance was associated with the law at that time. God, therefore entered into Covenant relationship with Abraham, not because of his religiosity, but because of his obedience to the commandments and statutes which governed every-day life. Men, for some reason best known to themselves, appear reluctant to accept that God is as interested in matters pertaining to the Law as He is in those relating to individuals. While the Scripture positively states that Abraham kept God's Laws, certain individuals aver that as no such rules of conduct are recorded as being received from God at that time, the Scripture must be in error and that the Patriarch in fact lived under the law-system enforced by the Babylonian king Hammurabi.

The Code of Hammurabi

While there is a certain amount of controversy concerning the date of the reign of Hammurabi, it is generally accepted that he lived at and ruled Babylon during Abraham's life-time. In 1902, archaeologists unearthed a large fragment of black diorite at Susa which subsequently proved to be the law code of Hammurabi, the son of Sin-muballit the Babylonian king. This round-topped stela is today on exhibition in the Louvre at Paris, while an exact replica may be found in the British Museum. The bas-relief shows Hammurabi standing before the enthroned sun-god Shamash, the patron of law and justice, receiving from

the god his kingly authority and law-giving power. Allowing for the exaggerations which characterised most of the biographies of ancient kings, may not the Code of Hammurabi contain the germ of truth in that, being descended from Noah, did he not perpetuate the mandate given to Noah by placing himself in his forefather's position? This could be the answer to the undoubted similarity which exists between the Code of Hammurabi and the Law given to Israel at Sinai. Hammurabi's Code includes almost 300 paragraphs of legal provisions touching commercial, social, domestic and moral life. Among these, one finds court procedures meticulously set out with perjury or false accusation in a capital case carrying the death penalty. Other crimes too, such as theft, kidnapping and house-breaking were similarly dealt with. Other laws regulated farm rentals, deposits and debts, rental of cattle, wages of labourers, with even the construction industry governed by regulations which demanded that if a builder erected an unsafe house which subsequently fell upon its owner and killed him, the builder himself was liable to the death penalty. The provision laid down in Genesis 9:6 concerning capital punishment for murder - enacted some three or four centuries before Hammurabi - is found in the Code which demands: "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe".

Paragraph 146 of the Code reads: "If a man has married a priestess, and she has given to her husband a female slave who bears children; and afterwards that slave ranks herself with her mistress, because she has borne children, her mistress may not sell her for silver. She may be fettered and counted among the slaves". While one may not be absolutely certain, this law could possibly have been the motivation behind Sarah's attempt to produce seed to Abraham (Genesis 16:1-7), although it is patently obvious that the latter end of the Code-law was not invoked when Hagar 'despised' Sarah for not bearing a child herself. Hagar was not 'fettered and counted among the slaves' but was sent out of the Abrahamic household.

However, while similarities do exist between the Code of Hammurabi and the Law given later at Sinai, one finds diametrically opposed clauses such as attitudes toward idolatry, sorcery and witchcraft which are encouraged in the Code, but forbidden in the Law. While many have suggested that Moses refined the Code of Hammurabi, archaeological discoveries are forcing a reappraisal of this viewpoint for the existence of earlier law-codes have been uncovered without the corruptions evident in Hammurabi's Code which have suggested to sincere students that the resemblance between the two may be seen in terms of common heritage rather than as proof of direct dependency. In other words, the fact is dawning on many that the starting point in this subject was God's mandate to Noah and while corruption set in when men sought to implement this, the Law given at Sinai was essentially the same as that originally given to Noah.

The 'Law that was Added'

Attention is once again focused on Abraham whose commitment to God's world Purposes and whose covenanted progeny was likewise committed, resulted from his obedience to 'my voice, my commandments, my statutes and my laws' (Genesis 26:5). From this, unless one disbelieves God's Word, it is patently obvious that God's commandments, statutes and laws had come down, despite the post-flood rebellion (Genesis 11:4), in an unadulterated form - and this through the Shemetic family line. It should be noted again that God did not say His selection of Abraham was because he kept the law, but specifically my laws. The commissioning of Abraham and his seed after him - the Covenant of Promise in terms of national possessions was thus associated with commandments, statutes and laws and had absolutely nothing to do with ordinances of sacrifice which were added some four hundred

years later. Ferrar Fenton's translation of Galatians 3:17 confirming this by recording: "And I assert this - the ritual, beginning four hundred and thirty years after, could not cancel a settlement previously established by God, so as to abolish the promises". It is therefore erroneous to suggest that the fulfilment of God's Covenant Promises was dependent upon obedience to or acceptance of a ritual of sacrifice which only came into existence some four centuries later.

Abraham's dedication to keeping the Law of the Lord was the subject of the soliloquy of God in Genesis 18:17-19. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." The 'way of the Lord' is here described as having to do with 'justice and judgment' - again no reference is found suggesting that adherence to ritualistic sacrifice was a pre-requisite. Abraham's covenanted progeny were thus required to keep the way of the Lord which resulted in 'justice and judgment' - features which are essential to orderly social relationships - the lack of which was branded into the national consciousness during the period of their sojourn in Egypt.

Israel - Ruled by God

Abraham's covenanted progeny, now called the Children of Israel, had, by this time, merely been constituted as the recipients of the Covenant Promises and it remained for Sinai to be the scene where, as a nation, they received a national charter from God and were enjoined to administer His commandments, statutes and judgments. Prior to this, they had received instruction from their elders and parents, but mere knowledge of the law certainly does not bring it into operation, nor will that knowledge compel men to observe and obey its precepts. These facts had been demonstrated time and again prior to the call of Abraham but now, at Sinai, a nation received its charter and was required to administer God's commandments, statutes and judgments. They were required to be Israel - ruled by God in order to fulfil their commission to be a blessing to all the nations of the earth. (Deuteronomy 4:6)

As the nation gathered at the foot of the mount in the Sinai peninsula, Moses went up into the mountain and received a commission from God Who said: "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel" (Exodus 19:3-6). Moses submitted this proposal to the assembled nation and once again it should be stated that the nation's understanding of the covenant was limited to the proposal and not to anything which may be added at some later stage. It should be noted that God had stated that adherence to the covenant would result in the children of Israel becoming 'a kingdom of priests' which, as understood by the people in the context in which it was uttered, would transform them into a kingdom of administrators. The Hebrew word kohen, while generally associated with the priestly function of sacrifice, is, according to Gesenius, of Arabic derivation and usually associated with rule or administration. In the original Hebrew text, David's sons are called kohen (2 Samuel 8:18) and being of the tribe of Judah, are referred to as 'rulers'. Thus in the proposal put to the nation, they understood and accepted that they were required to be a 'kingdom of administrators' if they entered into the covenant. "And all

the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do” (Exodus 19:8).

It was only after this acceptance and subsequent to the re-giving of the Law that a new thing was added - the ordinances of sacrifice. As is obvious, ‘sin was in the world’ (Greek: kosmos -world system) i.e., the law given to Noah under the mandate was broken, but it was not imputed to them i.e., the nature of its giving and acceptance was not as it now became at Sinai. Now transgression of the law was imputed to them and because of this, the reconciliation mechanism of substitutionary sacrifice was established in the shedding of blood. It was in this context that the Aaronic priesthood came into being to offer the blood of bulls and goats which merely covered or hid from sight, the transgression of the Law. This ordinance obtained until full and final forgiveness was delivered when the Perfect Lamb gave Himself on Calvary and ended the ordinances once and for all. This is that which was finished when the Lord issued that cry from the cross - not the commandments, statutes and judgments. It is indeed *‘easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail’*.

In this first section, it is hoped that many misconceptions concerning the continuing validity of the Law of the Lord have been corrected and that one is now in a better position to grasp the fact in the near future, the Law which shall go forth of Zion (Micah 4:2), is the same Law which was codified at Sinai and engraved upon the heart and mind of God’s Israel People when the Lord Jesus Christ initiated the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31; Hebrews 8:8). As world events proceed along satanically determined lines and God’s People find themselves becoming isolated because of their rejection of extremes in demands by the heathen and other nations of the world, such isolation will indeed bring about the need for a way of life tailored for such a contingency - **the Law of the Lord**.

The Law Codified

A well-known writer has stated: "By and large the great bulk of the White race is staying well clear (of the present world situation). They are turning the responsibility for the preservation of their race and culture over to some unknown 'they' while they continue to disparage either the organisation or the person that is standing up and doing battle. Much of this is done quite automatically as a result of deliberate brain-washing. Yet this is what must be overcome, there must be a broad support base for the activists who are willing and able to do battle".

For some unaccountable reason there is a strange limitation within the make-up of Western man which causes him to ignore the Laws of God; Laws which are, without a doubt, the very epitome of nature itself. Obviously the choice to date has been to follow political dogmas rather than God's Way of Life -- HIS LAW.

It is the purpose of these articles to show how this Law should be applied and it is hoped that through this effort to alert people as to the only way out of the present chaos, a renewal of faith in Almighty God will result and to such an extent that the Western countries will throw off not only their lethargy, but the control of the alien who is seeking their destruction.

At all times it should be noted that the Israel people of the Old Testament are to be found today in the Anglo-Saxon people of the West. Thus the Law of the Lord must be applied if true peace and happiness are to become a reality.

The Law Codified - the First Step

To many it may seem unnecessary to study the finer points of the Bible story especially in this day and age when mankind has advanced so far along the road toward self-determination and apparent utopia. These people will maintain that man has reached the place where Almighty God is only necessary to those in need of psychiatric treatment and yet, from all the signs of the times it is more than a little obvious that, in spite of the great scientific advancements man has made, liberty is fast running out. Today, political ideologies are manipulating events so as to provide no choice other than to follow the present socialistic trends. In other words, 'better red than dead' and yet - is this really all that the future holds? There still remains, strange as it may seem, the choice of following God and His Laws which are the only true expression of real liberty in which genuine peace will result. As Joshua of old said: "... choose you this day, whom ye will serve" (Joshua 24:15). Indeed, this is the day when the true people of God - Israel of the Bible and AngloSaxondom of today - must stand up and be counted.

There can be no doubt that the Authority of the Lord Jesus Christ attends the contention that it is 'easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail', and because of the present political wilderness into which the modern descendants of God's Covenant People (the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and Kindred People) have wandered, it behoves these people to reconsider God's Law and to re-discover the Constitutional machinery so graciously given. Subsequent to the national commitment which reverberated around mount Sinai when "*all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do*" (Exodus 19:8), one finds that the first requirement toward becoming the 'kingdom of administrators'

was: *"Thou shalt have no other gods before me"* (Exodus 20:3). This is the centrality of the whole Law and which was a political instrument to which was later added the religious ordinances of propitiatory sacrifices. The prohibition against 'other gods' - sovereigns or rulers - was thus essentially in a *political context* - the religious following as an additional placatory machinery against violation of the Laws thus Divinely given.

Having prefaced this primary requirement of no other 'gods' by calling attention to the then recent deliverance from Egypt - *"I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage"* (Exodus 20:2) - God re-asserted His Political Reality by demanding total reverence and obedience to the Constitution about to be given. It should be noted that the very first step toward the nation accomplishing its role as a 'kingdom of administrators' (Hebrew: kohen) was the requirement that the nation accept His Political Reality as distinct from the specious theology which surrounded the man-created gods of Egypt. The Lord God of Israel had demonstrated the impotence of theological gods which, despite the invocations of the various priesthoods during Egypt's 'day of visitation', remained as inert and sterile as the faith which created them.

Israel had seen this impotence during the ten plagues just as the nation had witnessed the tremendous power of the One Living God Who opened the passage through the Red Sea in order that His People might escape the following Egyptians and thus rendezvous with Him before the Mount of the Law. They had seen too the Power of their God Who changed the bitter waters of Marah, Who provided Manna six days of the week, Who again provided water out of the rock at Rephidim and Who afforded them the victory over the Amalekites - all this branding into the consciousness of the people that they indeed walked under the benevolent protection and benediction of the One True Living God. They had now learned the reason behind the Lord's oft-repeated claim and revelation as 'the Almighty' (Genesis 17:1; Exodus 6:3) and could now appreciate His assertion of total sovereignty and consequently His call to obedience. Since, as He had demonstrated, He was absolute Power, all subordinate and created powers derived their office, power and moral authority from Him and this was to be exercised on His terms and under His jurisdiction. *"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."*

Despite this wealth of experience and notwithstanding their voluntary commitment to 'do' all which the Lord had spoken, it is a matter of Biblical history that these people, so richly endowed, broke this first requirement within a few days of receiving it. While Moses was on the Mount with the Lord, the people built and worshipped the molten calf claiming 'these be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt' (Exodus 32:4). This incredible lapse appears to be totally inconsistent with all that had transpired only a few days earlier and yet the bald facts are that Israel certainly made and worshipped the molten calf. In seeking an answer to this infidelity one notes that within the disciplinary judgment which followed that ". . . Moses saw that the people were naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies)" (Exodus 32:25). The usual picture of an orgy in nudity which is painted by most teachers in respect of the worship of the molten calf derives its origin from these words which, as shall be seen, are a very loose translation and tend to divert attention from the true significance of the text. It is certainly not intended to 'white-wash' the Israelites - they were weak and easily persuaded just as are their modern descendants - but the picture of nude Israelites prancing before the image of the calf obscures the fact that influential 'enemies' were in the midst of the people. The literal translation of this verse as provided by Joseph Magil in *The English-man's Hebrew-English Old Testament* and verified by Rabbi Hertz in *Pentateuch and Haftorahs* reads: "And when Moses saw the

people that it was broken loose, for Aaron had let it loose for a disgrace (derision) among their opponents . . .”

Who were these ‘opponents’? It is inconceivable that they comprised remnants of the Amalekites who had been routed in Israel’s first national conflict with other nations for these people were anathema to Israel being the object of God’s sworn enmity from generation to generation (Exodus 17:16). The only other people, apart from Israel itself present before the Mount of the Law, was the ‘mixed multitude’ which had left Egypt with Israel at the commencement of the exodus (Exodus 12:38). If one considers the later parable spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ concerning the ‘wheat and the tares’ (Matthew 13:24-30 and 36-43), while its context may appear to indicate the Christian dispensation, the principle of sowing a disruptive influence among the ‘children of the kingdom’ is certainly Satan’s *modus operandi* whenever the Lord God put into operation a machinery of correction. Prior to Sinai, indeed as Israel began the trek to Canaan, the Lord had made provision for this mixed multitude in that He provided specific commands as to their place in Israel, but it would appear that then, as now, the wisdom of the Lord’s Directives was considered harsh and unrealistic - of which, more later.

Forty years later when a new generation of Israelites had grown up in the wilderness, Moses re-instructed the people concerning the Law and, as always, re-emphasised the First Commandment as central and basic to the whole Law. “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and upon thy gates.” (Deuteronomy 6:4-9)

In this statement, apart from re-emphasising the centrality of God to His Law, Moses instructed the people concerning the procedures whereby this priority might be observed thus including day to day practices in which the individual is brought face to face with reminders of God at all times. It should be noted that these procedures are not found in the actual Law, but were added by Moses who, knowing his people, provided the necessary incentives whereby the Lord God of Israel was kept in remembrance before the people. Thus, whatever may be said about Moses and the procedures which he laid down, it cannot be said that he ever deviated from the First Commandment in its purest form. The centrality of God within all aspects of the nation’s life became his obsession and rightly so too for a nation committed to the role of witnessing to God (Isaiah 43:10) must of necessity have God as the centre of its life.

None can accuse Moses of engendering an attitude in which the people accepted that they were God’s Chosen People and therefore subject to His favouritism without any responsibility on their part. Moses said: “*And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul; and to keep for thy good the commandments of the Lord, and his statutes, which I command thee this day*” (Deuteronomy 10:12-13). Thus, in this and indeed throughout his leadership of the Covenant People, Moses insisted on the totality of God’s Sovereignty and demanded Israel’s complete dedication to the observance of the Law as the expression of the nation’s love for its God.

As happened so frequently throughout His Ministry when questioned and even challenged concerning priorities in loyalty, the Lord Jesus Christ merely pointed to the Scriptures with the simple statement ***'It is written'*** (Matthew 4:4). When questioned about the 'great commandment in the law', He replied: *"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind"* (Matthew 22:37) - a direct quote from the Law which was the responsibility of Israel. Ignoring the context in which the original statement was made as well as the exclusiveness embodied in the phrase 'the Lord thy God', most teachers of today, in their obsession with the social gospel contend that the Lord's priorities were wrong when He said: *"And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."* Today it is claimed that 'loving thy neighbour as thyself' is the ultimate expression of 'loving the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind' irrespective of whether or not the interpretation of 'neighbour' accords with that indicated by God in His Word. If modern teachers were indeed sound workmen studying to show themselves approved unto God, they would heed the words of the Lord Jesus Christ and 'search' or 'work out' (Greek: ergo) the Scriptures, accepting this as the yard-stick for faith instead of compromising God's Truth for a mess of coloured pottage. The word 'neighbour', in both the Old and New Testaments, carries the same meaning and does not, by any stretch of imagination, cover the brotherhood of man. The *ra'ah* or 'neighbour' is specifically defined as one of the same family, clan or race and to force it out of its context is to do violence to the words of the Bible and the context in which they appear.

God, Israel and the Strangers

Many today have discarded the Old Testament record because it contains many aspects and demands which are unpalatable and certainly incompatible with what men conceive as the actions and requirements of God. In this way, just as did the Egyptians of old, they are creating a God Who is amenable to the urgings of people and Who accepts worship and service which they offer Him. It would appear that the fact of God having specifically issued positive Directives - it should be noted that these were not procedures framed by Moses or any man - means absolutely nothing. Men have the unparalleled temerity to discard the command of the Ever Living God and to replace this with some emotional, socialising platitude, the operation of which would be the very antithesis of that which fell within the phrase: ***'Thus saith the Lord'***.

As has just been stated, many of God's Directives are unpalatable to those who think that their attitudes, governed by their love for God, are acceptable to Him regardless of whether they accord with what He has laid down in His Law. One of these 'unpalatables' concerns relationships between people. When, on the occasion of the exodus from Egypt, "... a mixed multitude went up also with them . . ." (Exodus 12:38), the Lord made positive provisions for their place in the community which were ratified and added to when the whole body of Law was codified at Mount Sinai. It will be noted that the night of Israel's deliverance was to be observed by the 'ordinance of the passover' (Exodus 12:43) and in the subsequent account, this 'mixed multitude' was divided into those who could eat and those who could not. For instance, in verse 43 the following restrictive command appears. "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof." In verse 45, a similar prohibition appears: "A foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof"; while in verse 48, a stranger, upon circumcision, is permitted to join in and eat the passover. This is admittedly confusing, but is a confusion arising out of the translation and not the original text. In the Hebrew of the text quoted above there are three different words, and in other portions of the Old Testament, six variants of the same words have been treated

as though they meant the same thing. Ignoring the different Hebrew words, the translators indulged in over-simplification by providing one English word as the translation of six different Hebrew words. In the text of Exodus 12, three different words appear and are (1) *Nokriy*, (2) *Toshabh* and (3) *Ger*, two of which are forbidden to eat the passover while the third, attendant upon his acceptance of circumcision, is permitted to join Israel.

The Context of These Words

Remembering that there were ‘opponents’ with Israel at the foot of the Mount when the nation violated the First Commandment, may it not be that they could be identified by the Hebrew word which separated those who could and could not eat the passover? If one considers the first ‘stranger’ (verse 43) who could not eat, one finds that this is the *nokriy* which Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible defines as “alien, foreigner, outlandish, strange, stranger: man or strange woman”. Here too one finds an over-simplification for throughout the Old Testament this word is used in a specific manner and covers Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites - the product of incestuous relationships - as well as those who, in Deuteronomy 23:2, are referred to as ‘bastards, or the product of miscegenation’. It would thus appear that among that ‘mixed multitude’ which accompanied Israel in the Exodus there were either Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites or those of mixed or spurious origins.

These people were not permitted to enter the congregation of the Lord (Deuteronomy 23:2-3; Nehemiah 13:1) nor were they permitted to participate in the year of release when indebtedness was cancelled (Deuteronomy 15:1-4). It is significant that the *nokriy* is singled out specifically as one from whom usury may be obtained, for in Deuteronomy 23:19-20 it states: “*Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger (nokriy) thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury.*” The Canaanite who falls within the scope of this word thus differentiating between a dweller in Canaan and one who is descended from the son of Ham (Genesis 9:22) is forbidden in terms of marriage (Genesis 24:3) and is therefore subject to separation from Israel in a very real sense.

Ruth - the Nokriy

While it may appear strange to intrude the story of Ruth at this stage, it becomes necessary when one realises that the word *nokriy* is intruded in the Hebrew text in connection with this ancestress of the Davidic household. The implications of this are surely clear, particularly in the light of the genealogy of Matthew 1:5 where Ruth is named in ‘the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham . . .’ (Matthew 1:1). Bearing in mind that a Moabite ‘shall not come into the congregation of God for ever’ (Nehemiah 13:1), one is confronted with the problem of Ruth who is generally called a Moabitess. Unfortunately space does not permit the full history of Ruth showing that she was domiciled in Moab and not descended from Lot’s relationship with his own daughters - attention must be focused on her relationship as a *nokriy*. As she fell before Boaz in the gleaning fields she said: “*Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldest take knowledge of me, seeing that I am a stranger (nokriy)?*” (Ruth 2:10). Boaz himself responds in such a manner as to cast serious doubts on the scribe’s integrity when copying from the older manuscript for Boaz claims: “. . . *I am thy near kinsman: howbeit there is a kinsman nearer than I*” (Ruth 3:12).

The point to note here is that a *nokriy* had no privileges under Israel Law and being forbidden to enter the congregation of the Lord, could not be involved in so intimate a mechanism as

that of the kinsman-redeemer which is set out in Leviticus 25:48- 49 and which limits its function to the Israel people. The nokriy, in terms of the usage of this word throughout the Old Testament, being no kindred of Israel has no rights or privileges which immediately indicates some error when being associated with Ruth.

Whatever is the reason behind God's Directives concerning the nokriy - and the history of Israel and the molten calf appears to provide some basis for the prohibition - one should bow to the wisdom of the Lord and be obedient to Him.

The next type of 'foreigner' forbidden to eat the passover (Exodus 12:45) is the person who is called the toshabh who too was numbered among the 'mixed multitude' which left Egypt with Israel. This word, in the Hebrew text, is not used very often but appears when denoting a person whose legal status is inferior to that of an Israelite. From the record of Leviticus 22:10 it would appear that the toshabh had freedom in the matter of access to the priests, but was forbidden to 'eat the holy thing' and with no recourse to circumcision as the means of gaining legal status wherein he could be a partaker in the privileges enjoyed by Israel. In Leviticus 25:45-46 it is stated that the children of the toshabh could be bought as perpetual slaves and that the year of release or Jubilee, did not apply to them. Harsh prohibitions indeed, but then the wisdom of the Lord far outweighs any substitute which men may seek to make.

The third type of 'stranger' mentioned as being present among the mixed multitude is the ger or in its plural form, gerim. This term has two applications and is used in connection with (a) an Israelite living outside the geographical locality inhabited by Israel and thus, with the passage of time neglected such things as circumcision etc., and (b) anyone descended from Noah who did not come under the classification of the nokriy or toshabh. It will be noted in Exodus 12:48 that the ger who submitted to circumcision was permitted to eat the passover and that in Leviticus 24:22, this ger is then admitted to all the privileges and responsibilities of an Israelite. *"Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger (ger), as for one of your own country: for I am the Lord your God."* Unless one returns to the original Hebrew text it is absolutely impossible to follow the mechanics of God's Law for the liberties taken in translating the text lead to confusion such as is apparent in the account of the mixed multitude in Israel as they left the land of Egypt. In this, as has been seen, one section of 'strangers' is definitely prohibited from eating the passover as were the 'foreigners' while other 'strangers', upon circumcision, were granted full political liberty in the Israel community.

While it does not come within the account of those categorised as the mixed multitude, the Hebrew word zuwr also translated as 'stranger' in the Authorised Version should be noted. It is used in the sense of something that is abominable to the Lord and generally something alien. This point is driven home very forcibly when one considers the devolution in Ephraim, the Birthright tribe which came to view God's Laws as a 'strange thing'. *"Because Ephraim hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him a sin, I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange (zuwr) thing"* (Hosea 8:11-12). In this sense, it is apparent that the word zuwr indicates something foreign or alien and repugnant to the Lord - a feature which emerges when one considers the usage of this word in connection with the children produced through miscegenation (Hosea 5:7). The prophet Isaiah writes of the 'strangers' (zuwr) who desolated both cities and land of Israel (Isaiah 1:7) while Jeremiah pin-points the amazing and fatal attraction which the zuwr had and has for Israel. *"How canst thou say, I am not polluted, I have not gone after Baalim? see thy way in the valley, know what thou best done: thou art a swift dromedary traversing her ways . . . Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst: but thou saidst, There is no hope: no; for I*

have loved strangers (zuwr), and after them will I go” (Jeremiah 2:23-25). From this it is very apparent that Israel’s downfall results from its attraction to both people and things which have a detrimental effect on the nation in terms of God’s Purpose in them.

In Summing Up

The First Commandment - *“Thou shalt have no other gods before me”* - may thus be seen as central to the national way of life for Israel. It demands total obedience and requires the complete rejection of anything which falls outside of or in opposition to *‘thus saith the Lord’*. The word ‘gods’ in this text is elohiym which, without the article, is usually associated with rulers in varying degrees. The First Commandment - if one accepts it - is total dedication to the Directives which follow and one is required to *‘love the Lord thy God’* by keeping His Commandments - even if they revolutionise one’s concepts; even if they lose friends and create enemies; even if it means running contrary to so-called world opinion. Israel’s task today is to learn the lesson of the past concerning priorities particularly when it comes to relationships - whether peace with God is more important than peace with men. The fatal attraction of others has always been Israel’s downfall because the nation and individuals within that nation allow their emotions to govern them instead of the wisdom of God’s Directives as revealed in His Law. One could wish that there was a more graceful way of saying things, but there is a point which needs to be made here. There are a lot of people who are able to isolate themselves from the reality of the present world problem. They will not accept that a great deal of the present trouble in the world is race and that the only real threat to the ultimate goal of those who are seeking world dominion - A ONE WORLD STATE - is the White Anglo-Saxon race. Nor can they see that the future of mankind will be decided by this generation. If the battle is lost now - there will be nothing left.

The Law of the Lord mitigates against universal participation. Stringent safe-guards against Israel’s integration with other nations are provided for with different types of people catered for in various ways. Previous comment has been made on the three types of ‘strangers’ nokriy, toshabh and zuwr - all of whom fall under the strictest controls and prohibitions. The gerim however, subsequent to acceptance of circumcision, was permitted to enter the Israel congregation with all the privileges of Law participation. Thus, it is patently obvious that the Law itself could not attract other nations, whereas obedience to it with its promised attendant blessing, certainly could. This is precisely the picture which Moses presented when he exhorted his people to keep God’s statutes and judgments for the attendant blessing associated with obedience to this would earn the acclaim of the nations: *“Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people”*.

The operation of the statutes and judgments in Israel will have the effect of establishing the centrality of God in the nation for Moses continues to reflect on the consequences of this obedience by stating: *“For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God in all things that we call upon him for?”* (Deuteronomy 4:7). This, of course, gives substance and meaning to the statement recorded in Isaiah 43:12 in which God said: *“I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed, when there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses that I am God”*. Israel could and can only witness to God through obedience to His Directives which are recorded in the Law of the Lord.

Sinai and Its Aftermath

Notwithstanding the principles of 'life and good, death and evil' (Deuteronomy 30:15) which had been written by the Finger of God and given to Moses for transmission to Israel (Exodus 31:18), plus the tremendous demonstration of the Reality of God against the back-ground to the giving of the Law, Israel, with the passage of time, was induced to look upon God's Law as 'an alien thing' (Hosea 8:12). The vast machinery in the national Constitution was discarded by the nation which, on its own admission, spurned God's Law for regulating inter-racial and inter-national relationships, and deliberately followed after them (Jeremiah 2:55). What was forgotten then as it is today is that while men verbally repudiate God's Holy Law, this puny act in no way cancels out the effect of disobedience to this which takes its toll whether men like it or not. This point is fully demonstrated in the subsequent history of Israel in the land of Canaan.

The writings of the prophets, uninhibited by so-called public or world opinion which raises a howl of protest when the truth concerning the detrimental effect of inter-racial impingements is mentioned, simply records the bald facts. Isaiah, without any recourse to so-called diplomacy, reports that: "*Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers (Hebrew zuwr, alien) devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers (Hebrew zuwr)*" (Isaiah 1:7). In the plainest of language, the prophet accused the people of violating the Law concerning the alien who had by this time become integrated with Israel and who was then pushing for the abolition of God's Land Tenure Act. The 'devouring' of the land by these aliens, according to Gesenius, indicates a conquest and subsequent impoverishment of it and the people. Isaiah's indictment as with that of Hosea (Hosea 7:9) tells the story of the alien take-over - not through military conquest - but because of the apathy and lawlessness of the people. The national and individual security which the Law of the land provided was thus shattered and the people entered the first stage of national disintegration.

The Land Tenure Act

As the situation in modern Israel i.e., the Anglo-Saxon and Kindred People, is almost identical with that of their forebears in Canaan, it would serve a very useful purpose to reconsider God's gift of the land and His Directives concerning this.

At the outset, one is confronted with the subject of ownership and the Law makes it very plain that God is the owner. "*The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers (Hebrew gerim, legal guests) and sojourners with me*" (Leviticus 25:23). The Hebrew text of this passage is most interesting in that it indicates a prohibition against 'merchandising the land' or appropriating it from its original owner.

It is merely a repetition of scriptural fact that God gave to Abraham and his posterity the land of Canaan (Genesis 15:18) and that this land was divided among the children of Israel, each portion of which became a family inheritance. Before proceeding, it would serve to realise that the land of Canaan was not the only land promised to Israel as an inheritance, for if the nation was to accomplish its purpose in blessing 'all the nations of the earth' and if it was to observe the Law of non-integration, it required territory of its own from which to operate. Provision for this was made in the original allocation of racial and national boundaries for, having assured Jacob-Israel that his posterity would spread abroad to the West, to the East, to the North and to the South (Genesis 28:14) and thus be a '*blessing to all the families of the earth*', through Moses, the Lord assured of land inheritances. "*Reflect on the ages of years - Ask your father, who will inform you, Your elders, and they will relate, How the Highest*

allotted the races, When he divided to the sons of man, Fixing the bounds of the nations, With a place for Israel's sons.” Thus, the Land Tenure Act which was laid down in God's Law at Sinai, was not only valid for occupancy of the land of Canaan, but also for the land inheritance subsequent to the removal from that land. Therefore, in all Anglo-Saxon lands as with those of their kindred nations, the same Law obtains.

With no apology for this digression, attention is once again focussed on the machinery which comprises the Law of the land. *“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Unto these the land shall be divided for an inheritance according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to the few thou shalt give the less inheritance: to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers they shall inherit. According to the lot shall the possession thereof be divided between many and few”* (Numbers 26:52-56). As each of the tribes were given their inheritance, further Laws guaranteed the security of tenure and while these may appear to be superficial in the extreme, they were designed to afford the maximum security to each family. *“So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe: for every one of the children of Israel shall keep himself to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers. And every daughter, that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers. Neither shall the inheritance remove from one tribe to another tribe; but every one of the tribes of the children of Israel shall keep himself to his own inheritance”* (Numbers 36:7-9).

God thus made provision in His Law that the land should continue to be the property of those to whom He had given it and as the family increased, the provision guaranteed an inalienable land inheritance. W.J. Cameron in “Economics of the Bible” puts this matter in a nut-shell when he says: “A child born into the nation of Israel was already provided for. His birth certificate was title deed to his estate. Under our system, estates are inherited by reason of someone's death; under God's law, an estate was inherited by reason of birth. Truly, that may be the difference between our systems - the difference between life and death. In Israel, children were an addition to the wealth of the land not a drain on its poverty”. With these facts still fresh in the memory it serves to recall that Moses stated that the Laws of God given to Israel at Sinai were indeed ‘life and good, death and evil’ and that God's People Israel permitted ‘death and evil’ to stalk through its society simply because it considered God's Directives an ‘alien thing’.

As a land inheritance is so fundamental to the security of the individual within the nation, it is necessary to consider further safe-guards which were imposed by the Lord in His Law. It would appear that within the tribes, families marked the extent of their land by boundary marks for in Deuteronomy 19:14, these marks are inviolate thus ensuring security to the family who could never be deprived of a means of livelihood. *“Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's land-mark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it.”* In Deuteronomy 27:17, he who removes the land-marks thus encroaching on another's land is called ‘cursed’ while the same prohibition may be seen in Proverbs 22:28; 23:10 and Job 24:2.

Calvin in his Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses draws attention to this Law when he wrote: “. . . for that every one's property may be secure, it is necessary that the land-marks set up for the division of fields should remain untouched, as if they were sacred.

He who fraudulently removes a land-mark is already convicted by this very act, because he disturbs the lawful owner in his quiet possession of the land; whilst he who advances further the boundaries of his own land to his neighbour's loss, doubles the crime by the deceptive concealment of his theft. Whence also we gather that not only are those thieves, who actually carry away their neighbour's property, who take his money out of his chest, or who pillage his cellars and granaries, but also those who unjustly possess themselves of his land".

National Demise

As one sifts through the recorded history of the disintegration of the nation in the land of Canaan, it is more than apparent that the whole process was the result of the total break-down of the Mosaic legislation with particular emphasis on those relating to the control of aliens and that governing land tenure. While some may object to the equation of Calvin's 'thieves' with the 'mixed multitude' comprising the nokriy and the toshabh the narrative as provided by both Isaiah and Hosea leaves one in no doubt that they contributed in no small measure to the down-fall of the nation. The 'strangers' against whom Israel's Law mitigated, would certainly have no affection for this mechanism and would, at every turn, work for its abolition. The fact that the stranger could not have an inheritance in the land in terms of God's Legislation would naturally invoke every endeavour to have this repealed and the only process by which this could be achieved would be to get the people to doubt the efficacy of the legislation and, through public clamour, implement a government which took in all people of the land regardless of their racial origins.

The security of land tenure which was assured in the Law of redemption (Leviticus 25:25,48,49) which could be invoked when an Israelite fell on hard times was forgotten and slowly but surely individuals and families were forced into financial bondage to the alien to whom both redemption and the year of release meant absolutely nothing. This, according to Hosea the prophet, was the first stage in the destruction of the nation for he wrote: "*My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge . . .*" (Hosea 4:6). Having forgotten the fundamentals of God's Law, they became an easy prey to all and sundry who exploited the situation.

The Lord God of Israel, through Hosea the prophet, pin-pointed the violation of the Laws of land tenure as one of the primary causes for the nation's down-fall in that He said: "*As they were increased, so they sinned against me . . .*" (Hosea 4:7). Even today people will say that the Laws of the land are incapable of perpetuating family ownership of any land for the population increase and the limitation of available land makes the whole structure of Biblical Law impractical. This is no doubt what the aliens suggested in those far-off days for it will be noted that 'as they were increased' they sinned against the Lord.

As has already been seen (Numbers 26:52-56) families received their land inheritance at the commencement of their occupancy of the land and that was determined 'by lot' with the larger families receiving a greater portion and the lesser a portion equal to their needs. Whatever else happened, these land inheritances were secured for the family for it could not be sold nor disposed of so as to deprive them of this basic security. When a family got too large, further land was acquired under a 'lease' system, but here again, the leased land was derived from another family of the same tribe. The lease was negotiated by consent for it was known and accepted by all that in the fiftieth year - the year of the Jubilee (Leviticus 25:8) - all property was returned to its original holder. "*And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee*

unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family" (Leviticus 25:10). Thus in Israel Law, the family was permitted forty-nine years to re-shape itself and in the fiftieth year, new allocations of land were sought under the lease system and in this way, all family increases were catered for.

It should not be thought that during this period all further leasing was stopped. Far from it, for this would mitigate against a progressive society and stultify initiative. At any time during the forty-nine year cycle, land was leased and as is related in Leviticus 25:15,16, the transaction was governed by law. *"According to the number of years after the jubilee thou shalt buy (lease) of thy neighbour, and according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee: According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for according to the number of years of the fruits doth he sell unto thee."* All these law-bound negotiations were designed to establish stability and security in the family while at the same time, they provided for the increase in population in such a way as to provide a living and yet not deprive any of their basic security.

That this was broken down by 'strangers' is all too evident for how else could *'strangers devour your land in your presence'* (Isaiah 1:7)? The Land belonged to Israel having been given by God and while the nation observed His Laws, no stranger or fellow Israelite for that matter, could expropriate another's land. No encouragement was given to large-scale holding of land by either families or co-operatives for the land itself had no commercial value. The 'increase' from the land was its only value and this could only be achieved by hard work and diligent labour. This was recognised in the Law of the tithe in which only the *natural increase*, not the land itself, became the object of the tithe which was a percentage of a man's earnings. Thus speculation in land had no place in God's Law but, with alien influences at work and a lack of knowledge in Israel, speculation became rife which too added its toll to the diminishing economy of the nation. *"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth"* (Isaiah 5:8).

The 'devouring' of Israel's land by the strangers left the families in a parlous position. Laws were enacted which broke down a stubborn resistance in which land-taxation finally deprived the people of their God-given security. No Administration, be it provincial or local, had the right to impose taxes for, as has been stated previously, the land itself was worthless being only the means whereby an increase could be realised. However, as a means whereby total control of the people might be achieved, local governments imposed taxes in direct violation of the Mosaic Legislation and, deprived of the knowledge of their rights under this, the families of Israel were finally swallowed up by the alien who had no compunction in depriving the people of their inheritance.

If one correlates the recorded history of the demise of Israel in the land of Canaan as written by both Isaiah and Hosea, the picture of the wisdom of the Lord as found in His prohibitions against the infiltration of the 'strangers' becomes apparent. Isaiah's picture of 'strangers devouring the land' has its sequel in Hosea's record wherein it is stated: *"... For they shall eat, and not have enough ... because they have left off to take heed to the Lord"* (Hosea 4:10). With the acquisition of the land by the strangers to whom the Law of the Lord meant nothing, the feeding of the population was impeded by a further violation the violation of the sabbath of rest prescribed for the land every seven years (Leviticus 25:1-11). As with today, food was then available but impoverished of all nutrition by a land which had been denied its

cycle of rest. Israel indeed had bulk, but the life-giving nutrition was missing - all because a people, to whom the Law of the Lord meant nothing, exploited their position of strength in the land.

With individual and national security undermined through the loss of its land inheritance, it is small wonder that their will to resist the military invasions of both Assyria and Babylon was at such a low ebb and why these powers were able to remove the nation into captivity with such comparative ease. It is small wonder too why modern atheistic forces such as communism and its allied associates in socialism are finding no opposition today when no fundamental security in land tenure exists to motivate resistance to the forces of spiritual and national erosions.

What can we do right now? Our land - and this applies to all Western countries - is being taken away from us either through increased government control or through the manipulation of 'strangers'. To begin with we can 'each one reach one' with facts concerning our rights according to God's Law.

With God's help we can multiply this message and become a force which will defeat the present in-roads being made in our land by the forces of socialistic communism.

Value for money

“The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” (Matthew 8:20)

Resistance to any consideration of the Law of the Lord invariably stems from misconceptions concerning the New Testament record. What is largely forgotten today by those who disparage the Old Testament and who relegate its writing to the limbo of unimportant things, is that the New Testament is a sequel to the Old - the history of God's independent action arising out of the tragedy of Law violation perpetrated by Israel. The above quoted lament by the Lord Jesus Christ confirms this. In the Mosaic legislation, Israel's national Constitution guaranteed permanence - a freehold land inheritance which could never be alienated and an economic system which provided for all the needs of the people just as it did for the foxes and the birds. At the time of the First Advent, Israel as a nation, had become homeless pilgrims - sent out of the Promised Land under the Bill of Divorce (Deuteronomy 24:1-4) for spiritual adultery (Jeremiah 3:8) - awaiting Redemption and subsequent re-instatement in another Promised home (2 Samuel 7:10 and Deuteronomy 32:8). Thus, at that time, the words of the Lord adequately described the nation's condition for while the foxes indeed had holes and the birds their nests, Israel had no place of comfort and certainly no security in land inheritance.

Israel's condition at the time of the First Advent was precisely that which had been prescribed in Leviticus 26:33 for Law violation and to which Hosea had made reference when indicating that they would be 'wanderers among the nations' (Hosea 9:17). The English 'wanderer' is a very graphic illustration of the Hebrew nadad for it indicates those who have no permanent abode and consequently no secure economy upon which to thrive. The nation had lost its independence under the Mosaic legislation and as wanderers, were dependent upon others in terms of both land and economics.

National independence, guaranteed under the Law, was stated in Deuteronomy 28:1-13 under the following conditions. *“And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth . . . And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and to do them.”* Being the 'head' and not the 'tail' was conditional upon obedience to all the commandments of the Lord. As an added inducement to keep the Divine Constitution, the alternative to obedience was set before the nation in the words: *“But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses (penalties) shall come upon thee, and overtake thee . . . The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low”* (Deuteronomy 28:15-43). This indeed happened and while national independence was shattered when the strangers devoured the land (Isaiah 1:7), it finally disintegrated when the nation lost its economic freedom.

As has been seen previously, the Lord's indictment against Israel was communicated initially through both Hosea and Isaiah the prophets, the latter bluntly stating that the alien had

succeeded in depriving the nation of its independence through the appropriation of the land. As the result of this loss, the fundamental economy of the nation was undermined and the flood-gates of antinomianism (lawlessness) were opened. In his continuing account of the Lord's indictment against Israel, Isaiah equated the nation with Sodom and Gomorrah for he wrote: *"Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water"* (Isaiah 1:10 and 22). The priorities in the Lord's indictment against Israel are thus very clear in that they take in the violation of the land-laws as fundamental to all others with those concerning finance closely linked.

Value in the Medium of Exchange

Today's generation exercises a patronising attitude toward ancient civilisations which are generally equated with primitive and sluggish attempts to formulate policies in economics which invariably failed. This attitude generally dominates when the Economic Law of the Lord is broached. Far from accepting that the Lord God could be interested in such matters as finance, men today look on the Law of Economics in the Bible as Moses' contribution to the long list of economic failures which underwrites the attempts of men in this direction. It should be stated with all emphasis that the Economic Law of the Lord communicated by Moses did not fail because of flaws in this, but because the nation failed to keep the 'law of the strangers' which was imperative to the perfect functioning of the nation's economy. In a closed economy such as that of Israel in Canaan and such as could happen again when world sanctions are imposed upon any of the modern states in Anglo-Saxondom, there was no way of evading any of the requirements of the Law for each individual knew that it was a sin before God to break the least of the commandments and that sin was like 'leaven' which would eventually corrupt the whole nation. The 'stranger', not permitted participation in the Law, would naturally work for the abolition of such legislation and would therefore corrupt any system in economics which did not make provision for him. This certainly happened in Israel.

It would serve a very useful purpose at this stage to realise that while barter was practised in which men exchanged their labour and goods for the labour and goods of others, a system of money for value was also in operation. Abraham was part of this system for it will be recalled that in purchasing the cave of Machpelah, he paid "four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant" (Genesis 23:16). A further instance of the use of 'money' is recorded in the transaction in which veils were bought for Sarah and her attendants, Abimelech paying "a thousand pieces of silver" for these (Genesis 20:16). Money was used in the purchase of food from Egypt when Jacob's sons bought this from their alienated brother Joseph (Genesis 43:21) and later, at the time of the exodus, one finds that this money was uncoined weighed value - the shekel - and had become a special system of which the standard examples were to be kept by the priests. While gold was considered as valuable, all transactions were made in silver which was the recognised currency of that time, the value of which was determined by weight.

With regard to the utilisation of existing standards, Leviticus 19:35-37 sets out the following: *"Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in mete-yard, in weights, or in measure. Just balance, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have; I am the Lord your God which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments and do them: I am the Lord"*. In this one may see again the priorities of the Lord for the first commandments here refer to the mete-yard, the standard measure

determining the amount of land leased while the second concerns finance in that the ‘weights’ have to do with the talent, shekel and other weights of money. Measures (of the ephah and hin) have to do with capacity while the balances indicate a commodity economy rather than the money economy which today cripples nations and people. In the Law of the Lord, it is patently obvious that goods or commodities had an established silver unit of value and that the increase in the volume of silver depended entirely upon the productivity or industry of the people. There was no such word as ‘inflation’ in the Israel economy for then the volume of money in circulation depended entirely upon the abundance from agriculture or industry. Today, with no righteous method of balancing gold against supply and demand, fluctuating prices and inflation are inevitable.

A Capitalist Economy

While throughout the Law of the Lord there are strict demands that all transactions conform to specific rules with every departure equated as a defilement of both men and land (Leviticus 18:24-30), the whole economy of the nation is designed as a capitalist one.

“Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God, in not keeping his commandments, and his judgments, and his statutes, which I command thee this day: Lest when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses, and dwell therein; and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply, and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, and all that thou hast is multiplied; Then thine heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God, which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage . . . But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth, that he may establish his covenant which he sware unto thy fathers, as it is this day” (Deuteronomy 8:11-18).

From this, and contrary to the prevailing ideologies of socialism or communism, private capitalism is not only endorsed by God’s Law, but is actually supported. It will be noted in the above quoted scripture that the Lord ‘giveth thee power to get wealth’ and this power is the full application of the Law of the Lord which guarantees the individual his full share of wealth according to his productivity. It requires very little elucidation here to indicate that within all the various lands of Anglo-Saxondom there is a concerted effort toward socialism which is aimed at the abolition of private capitalism (in direct opposition to the Law of the Lord) and the implementation of state capitalism to which end communism is fully dedicated.

Individual wealth is acquired by initiative, productivity, inheritance or a gift. All these fall within the frame-work of the Law while there are stringent prohibitions against acquiring it through other means. For instance, there is the most positive prohibition against making capital out of a fellow-Israelite’s misfortune who, for a wide variety of reasons, has fallen on hard times.

“If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury. If thou at all take thy neighbour’s raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down. For that is his covering only, it is his raiment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep?” (Exodus 22:25-27).

“And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger (Hebrew: ger, legal guest), or a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase”

(Leviticus 25:35-37). The same feature may be seen in Deuteronomy 23:19-20 where the previously noted difference in the Hebrew words simply translated as 'stranger' in the English translation becomes apparent. *"Thou shalt not lend tax upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury. Unto a stranger (Hebrew: nokriy, one of mixed, spurious or incestuous origins) thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it."* From these Scriptures and the prohibition against usury one may see that there is no incentive to invent means to lure people into debt for, in the Law of the Lord, no profit could be made from such a debt. Herein lies the master-piece of economic legislation for while credit is provided for in times of individual stress, such credit as a help and true favour provides the necessary assistance ***without the multiplication of the debt***. While this Law was very much in evidence in the early years of the Christian dispensation, S. Stein in his *"Interest Taken by Jews from Gentiles"* indicates that it had become the practice of the 'Jews' to ascribe 'his money to a gentile and he lends it to an Israelite on interest'. From this, one may see the reason behind the Lord's denunciation of the Jews who, having usurped Israelitish identity, made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions (Matthew 15:6). This invalidation of the commandments of the Lord was added to when the Jews created an intrinsic value in the money itself for all will surely remember the incident, just prior to the Crucifixion, when the Lord drove the money-changers out of the Temple. This was the time of the Passover, an event which made certain financial requirements of the people who were to pay half a shekel of silver (Exodus 30:12-15). As has been stated previously, Israel, under the 'bill of divorce' had become homeless pilgrims, but this did not prevent them from individually returning to Jerusalem to keep the Passover and at that time, the city was flooded with visiting true Hebrews. Various coins from many lands would have to be converted to the proper offering - the shekel and the money-changers performed this service making considerable profit in the transaction. The sale of doves too netted a fine profit to the monopoly within the Temple which used the Name of God in justification of their money market. Small wonder at the hostility of the Lord against them.

Money for Sale

Prior to passing on to the extension of the money-changers in the money-market of the Temple to the modern time, a final word on loans made under the Mosaic legislation. It has been suggested that the Lord Jesus Christ approved of interest on commercial loans - the instances of Luke 19:23 and Matthew 25:27 being cited in support of this. It should be noted that these are parables and parables are allegorical illustrations, not actual happenings. In these, the context was undoubtedly the Kingdom Gospel and the principle of interest in this is that referred to and not in money itself. The Law states: *"At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release. And this is the manner of the release: Every creditor that lendeth ought unto his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour, or of his brother; because it is called the Lord's release"* (Deuteronomy 15:1-2). The word 'exact' in this text is translated from the Hebrew *nagas* which militates against endowing the subject with interest of any kind for it means to tax, tyrannise or harass. Thus, at no stage is a loan of any kind the basis for exploitation for gain, but a mechanism of assistance when a fellow-Israelite finds himself in dire straits.

A.M. Wade in his *"Christianity and Economics"* makes the following observations in the evolution of the modern monetary system which may be seen as the extension of the system

which, being totally opposed to the Divine Law of Economics, was so roundly condemned by the Lord Jesus Christ.

“With the advent of the machine and steam power, conditions were set for a rapid increase in activity, to finance which new money was necessary. The old system of borrowing from a money-lender did not meet the requirements because he could not create new money - money being in the form of coin. Queen Elizabeth’s sailors had rendered valuable assistance in this matter by their acquisition of much silver and gold bullion, but this was not a permanent source of supply. However, money-lenders made a great discovery which met the needs in one way, though it was costly in the end.

"Silversmiths had been in business offering to provide safe storage of gold and silver plate and of money, for the landed gentry, for a fee. They would issue receipts against the valuables deposited, hence these pieces of paper represented the value of the deposit concerned.

“The silversmith, having established a reputation for honesty in the community, would find that his receipts, or notes of credit, were being exchanged for cattle and produce in local business deals thus relieving the buyers of the need to withdraw money to make the purchase, which would then be followed by the seller making a journey to deposit the money, with all the accompanying risks of highway robbery.

“With all this store of plate and money it was obvious that the silversmith was able to lend a percentage of it safely, hence he was in business to lend money and charge interest for its use. Providing he issued notes up to the value of his own money in cash, plus that on deposit with him, he was acting perfectly honourably. (Note: This would not increase the total amount of money in existence, but it would put into circulation that which would otherwise be lying in deposit.) But now we come to the great discovery - **CREDIT CREATION**.

“Having built up a reputation for integrity, the silversmith’s notes acquired the value of currency in the locality. The silversmith then awoke to the fact that he could issue additional notes safely, without the knowledge of the public. He could therefore increase his income from interest charges on ‘money’ loaned. He found from experience that on average, only one client in ten preferred to borrow cash, with all the risk of loss. In view of this it was learned that up to ten times the reserve could be issued by this piece of trickery. All would go well until the day when rumours circulated that the silversmith was insolvent, and depositors demanded their money in cash.

“Needless to say that while the going was good, this kind of money lending was highly profitable. In the earlier periods the silversmith made a charge for his services. But when he discovered that he could lend up to ten times his deposits, he was able to pay some interest to his depositors so that he could lend ten times the amount and at much higher interest also than he paid to depositors. This is how the banks operate today, but the public are not aware of the fact. Monetarists talk about the Government printing too much money, but they never allude to the practice of the banking system issuing vastly more (from five to ten times) in credit. Such concealment of the truth about the money system makes nonsense of all the arguments on the media and in the press. But in the financial pages this difference is acknowledged under the code of M1 for currency (what one might think of as real money, available for payment of wages and taxes) and M3 for total money supply, consisting mainly

of this non-material, mysterious, credit created by the banks as an inverted pyramid of money available to customers as overdrafts, costing nothing to create.

The Formation of the Bank of England in 1694

“This question of money supply was a vexed problem throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although local needs were met in one way, by the local money-lender, with his ‘elastic’ system of credit, it was not adequate for the growing needs of industry where large sums were required for investment. (Note: The money-lender did not provide a continuing source of new money, even under his system of deception. For, by the time his clients had paid their interest they would be unable to re-pay their principal. In other words, they would generally end in debt. The money-lender was really taking something out, not putting something in.) “Unrealised by the Government of the day, presumably, it was the duty and privilege of the State to provide all the means of exchange necessary for the well-being of the nation, and failing sufficient supplies of gold and silver it should have provided other means. In reality, wooden tallies had been in continuous use as debt-free credit instruments for nearly six hundred years. But for some unaccountable reason the Government surrendered its right of issue to this new privately owned company - the Bank of England.

“The Bank agreed to raise the sum of 1,200,000 pounds in cash to lend to the King (King William III) at 8 per cent interest. They were granted the right to issue notes to the value of their capital and to lend these at 8 per cent to the public. In this way they received permission to create paper money providing they held 100 per cent cover in cash.

“Needless to say this new Company, responsible also for the keeping of all State accounts for which it received an annual payment, made enormous profit. The new money available as debt to the Bank was soon taken up and the Bank then went over to the system already described, of issuing many times its cover, but this time in Bank notes, carrying the authority of the State.

“In passing, it should be remembered that in all these cases of borrowing money, from the money-lender or the Bank of England, or any bank, it is necessary to deposit an adequate security in case of failure to discharge the debt in due course. The lender in that case can fore-close on the security.

“Until a few years ago banks denied that they created money. This system is now termed ‘fractional reserve’. The bank holds onto a fraction of the deposits placed with it. In other words, 100 pounds deposited allows the bank to lend 1,000 pounds.

“Briefly, then, we see that for some obscure reason a fundamental mistake was made by surrendering to a private institution the sovereign right to issue money, costing only the printing, or in the case of Government accounts, mere figures in books, and to levy interest charges for this so-called money, with consequent debt of compound interest.

“The Government, having parted with its power to issue money, could not escape rising debt, for obvious reasons, which have no defence in reason and justice. Here, therefore, is the origin of the national debt.

“This unbelievable story receives no attention in the textbooks of economics, or in the speeches of politicians. No technical knowledge is required to see the utmost folly of a nation

committing itself to national finance on this principle of debt to a private company, and later, to the privately operated banking system. It is no wonder that monetary reformers, drawing conclusions from this system, are not taken seriously. Would any rational person believe that a nation would do it? What is more, would any thinking person, learning the truth of what happened, believe that such legislation would remain unrepealed during the following three hundred years?

“The inevitable consequences of such unscientific accountancy are naturally of two kinds, as per double entry book-keeping debit and credit.

“Firstly the credit side, claimed by the lender - the banking system.

“The Bank rapidly became immensely rich and powerful. Gladstone records that in all financial matters, the Bank of England exercised supreme control. The inescapable results of debt finance are high taxation in the attempt to re-pay capital and interest on the national debt - a completely impossible task slumps, until a new round of credit had been negotiated, then booms, at roughly ten year cycles, bankruptcies, imprisonment for debts, heavy taxation, and bad industrial relations, with unfailing inflation obviously geared to the cost of the credit, created by the banking system, though always spoken of as being created by the Government.

“Every manufacturer who had borrowed money to purchase a building and its equipment committed himself to repayment on demand (as it is with over-drafts) plus interest, probably at 8 per cent. This means that in nine years he must re-pay twice the sum borrowed.

“Let us envisage all borrowers acting in unison together with the Government, starting off with the new Bank of England, founded to provide money for the expanding economy, borrowing 10 million pounds. After nine years the Bank can demand 20 million pounds repayment or fore-close on securities, or alternatively the borrowers could take out a further loan. The money on loan will still be required in circulation unless there is to be a slump. If every penny were paid into the Bank a debt of 10 million pounds would remain. But 10 million pounds is needed in circulation, hence to maintain the position a new loan of 20 million pounds is required which will create a debt of 40 million pounds nine years later. The system therefore is not one of supplying money or credit to the nation, but one of extracting from the nation resources for the use of that which has cost nothing to create.” (End of Quote).

From this summary by Mr. Wade, together with the intriguing history of modern banking provided by the Encyclopaedia Britannica one is able to see the consequences - the ‘but’ clauses of the Law of the Lord in operation. The modern development of true Israel in the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and kindred people are now caught in a web of financial intrigue and cannot extricate themselves. However, time is running out and one can already feel the Hand of the Lord in world affairs. While men pessimistically face the future of world socialism which is nothing less than state capitalism and are prepared to surrender to the evils of an anti-God system as the hope for a future world, they forget that He who keeps Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps (Psalm 121:4). God’s Perfect system for Economics based on true value for wealth is yet to be the experience of His People and will be forced on them even though they may not want it. It was for this purpose that He created the people and as His Word is ‘Yea and Amen’ it shall surely prosper in the thing hereunto it was sent (Isaiah 55:11). God declared His Word to Israel and in Israel and the day is fast dawning when, through the operation of His Divine Constitution, nations shall say: “Surely this great nation is a wise and

understanding people, for what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for?”

SCRIPTURAL FACT VS. MAN'S FICTION

“And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.” (Leviticus 25:10)

As one reviews the modern fiscal systems with the complexity of manipulation, together with the increasingly stringent controls over the money earned by the sweat of man's brow, a sense of both hopelessness and helplessness is engendered which permeates every strata of human society. An individual, having totally committed himself to providing security for his family through labour in the field of his choice, is now face to face with the fact that his money is not his own and that the sum total of his life's labour can be wiped out - not by some natural catastrophe, nor even by an Act of Parliament, but at the dictates of private corporations who determine the currency barometers of the world.

The Hon. L.H. Hollins, in his work *“Inflation, its Cause and the Cure”*, quoting The Hon. Reginald McKenna, Chairman of the Midland Bank just prior to the Second World War, states: “All inflations and deflations of the currency come from a private corporation (The Bank of England), whose policy is not controlled by Parliament”. It is indeed small wonder that the honest man in-the-street is becoming resentful and that the embers of this are flaring, fanned by demands for changes in the economic and financial systems of the world.

Ignorant of the fact that a perfect system of economics is ready at hand, the world in general and Anglo-Saxondom in particular continues to wallow in the theology of delusion which insists on depriving God's People of the knowledge of the Lord's Political Reality and the reality of His Political Constitution for them. Ignoring the warning recorded by Isaiah the prophet (Isaiah 55:8), theology persists in ‘explaining God’ Whom they mould according to their own finite reasoning and Whose Divinely-given Law they reject as totally incompatible with modern living. Within this rejection, it is contended that ‘the Mosaic statutes were suitable only for a nomadic and primitive people with absolutely no relevance in modern society’. To support this view, illustrations are drawn from passages in Scripture which undoubtedly had a bearing on life as it obtained when Moses, under the authorisation of God, presented the Law to Israel. *“When you see the ass of your enemy fallen under its load, and you can ease and free it for him, you shall help to free it with him”* (Exodus 23:5, Ferrar Fenton). Such an illustration, far from providing evidence of the so called parochial limitations of God's Law, exposes the deliberate bias of men against the discipline demanded by the Lord of His people.

By contending that modern man does not use the ‘ass’ as a means of transportation (which is undeniably the case in the relevant Scripture), those who resort to such gymnastics expose the fact that they have mixed their priorities by placing the proverbial ‘cart before the horse’. By seizing on the illustration of the ass they have missed the principle of constructive cooperation between companies - be they transport or any other - which the Law demands. This Scripture provides the incentive to maintain a free enterprise system helping your competitor (the word ‘enemy’ in the relevant Scripture being translated from the Hebrew *sane* which indicates one who is an opponent competing in trade) to maintain his business thus guarding against monopolistic take-overs by the giant companies.

The contrast between business as practised today and that as laid down in the Law of the Lord is precisely that which Moses prescribed when he said: *"See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil"* (Deuteronomy 30:15). Business, under the present system which has been equated with that set up by the king of Babylon, centres on destructive competition which becomes war at all levels, together with its attendant consequences of misery, suffering, want and destitution. This is that against which the Lord warned in the passage of Scripture which men use in support of their contention concerning the so called parochial nature of the Law of the Lord - the story of the 'enemy', his ass and the difficult circumstances of the 'heavy load'.

Money and Usury

In returning to the subject of money and the utilisation of established standards as laid down in Leviticus 19:35-37, it should be noted that, apart from references to the fact of its existence, not very much is recorded concerning it. What does emerge from the Scriptures is that money is metal - gold and silver, coined or stamped, having a unit of value in itself. Modern currency, which includes token coins, government notes and bank notes, are merely promises to pay in money the face value of that which has been embodied in the currency and which, by man's law, has been made legal tender. As is obvious from the money markets of the world today, the currency system lacks stability and, like the promises of man, has no stable measure of value. For centuries, both gold and silver, by weight, were the unit of value used in all ancient business transactions - illustrations of which may be found throughout the Bible (Genesis 23:16; 43:21). King David, it will be recalled, paid fifty shekels of silver to Araunah for the threshing-floor and later, six hundred shekels of gold for the entire field in which this was located (2 Samuel 24:24). The point to note is that money was in circulation and that the money was a unit of value fixed in its relation to goods without any fluctuation in the standard of the value of the metal. The command of the Lord: *"Just balance, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have"* (Leviticus 19:36) was intended as the stabilising standard of money while in Deuteronomy 25:13-15 is the warning against manipulation in this. *"Thou shalt not have in thine bag divers measures, a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."* The 'thou shalt not' in this instance, apart from corroborating the fact of fixed standards of value, was intended as an instruction against the deliberate fluctuating of prices by merchants.

To those who charge that the Law of the Lord had validity only in the days in which it was given, the above quoted passage concerning the prohibition against the practice of using different standards (weights and measures) should be noted. In today's business dealings, commodities in the hands of the merchants are valued at a certain price - a price which immediately decreases the moment when a purchaser takes possession of the goods no matter what the usable value of these may be. A modern illustration of this may be seen when an automobile is purchased, driven ten kilometres and then re-sold to the dealer who has already depreciated the vehicle according to his standard of values. As must be obvious, such changing and varying values tend to enrich the seller at the expense of the buyer establishing, in the modern context, that the possession of money, no matter how acquired, is more desirable than the possession of goods - a vindication indeed of the charge that *"the love of money is the root of all evil"* (1 Timothy 6:10). This is that against which the Law of the Lord gives a warning, and is as valid today as it was in that day when Moses passed it on to Israel.

To the above mentioned prohibition against different standards of value is added the warning against exploitation, within the monetary sphere, of those who fall on hard times. This comes within the category of usury. This subject is one which has challenged the exegetical skills of scholars for the past two thousand years and remains an issue which is invariably left to the conscience of the individual. While uncertainty abounds concerning this subject, the historical narrative of the Scripture indicates that usury per se was one of the main causes of the down-fall of Israel. Is it purely coincidental that Jeremiah, in protesting his innocence when persecuted by his brethren, mentioned the subject of usury in this? *"I have neither lent on usury, nor have men lent to me on usury; yet every one of them doth curse me"* (Jeremiah 15:10). It is patently obvious that this subject figured prominently among the many causes which resulted in Israel's removal from the land of Canaan.

The prophet Ezekiel too was used by the Lord to communicate the fact that usury, among other sins, contributed to Israel's demise in the land of Promise. *"The word of the Lord came unto me again, saying, What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel He that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man, Hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God (He that) Hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase: shall he then live? he shall not live: he shall surely die; his blood shall surely be upon him"* (Ezekiel 18:1-13). It is thus more than a little evident that the Lord God of Israel viewed the violation of the Law prohibiting usury as a major sin.

This being so and in view of the wide-spread practice of taking usury or interest in Anglo-Saxondom since the seventeenth century with today's economy built almost entirely upon it, *a Biblical definition* should be considered. There are, of course, many theories about this subject and a lot of speculation has endowed investment returns with the nature of usurious practices. However, as in all things, one should let God's Holy Word provide its own definitions and, as Moses said: *"What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it"* (Deuteronomy 12:32). The Biblical definition of usury is established by each context in which the word is found and there is certainly no ambiguity in the text. The prohibition against usury is always found in the context of the poor from whom no increase or interest may be taken in the event of a loan having been given. *"If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thy heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother"* (Deuteronomy 15:7); *"If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee"* (Exodus 22:25); *"And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee take thou no usury of him, or increase"* (Leviticus 25:35-36). From these - and there are many other corroborating passages - one may see that the poor of the land is the context in which the prohibition against usury appears. The Israelites, as distinct from the Jews, were and are not a commercial people nor were loans required for business, hence the void in prohibition against interest in the context of loans or investments in profit-making businesses. The taking of increase, in the sense of a reasonable return on financial investment in trade is nowhere forbidden in the Scriptures.

It was, of course, perfectly legitimate to take increase from a 'stranger' (Deuteronomy 23:20) - the stranger in this case being the nokriy or one of incestuous origins. Such an increase fell

within the tithe or one tenth and which was then handed to the Levites who utilised it within the Israel community.

It has been noted previously that the break-down in Israel's economy in the land of Canaan was due to the integration of 'strangers' and the accommodation of these within the Israel community. As has happened all through the history of God's People Israel extending into that of their modern descendants the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and Kindred People, whenever a 'stranger', of all types referred to in the Hebrew text, are integrated with them, they have lowered their own standards to the detriment of the nation as a whole. In the land of Canaan, the Law-demanded discrimination against these strangers (Exodus 12:43 and 45; Deuteronomy 23:20) was abolished mainly through the failure of the Levitical teachers who corrupted the covenant (Malachi 2:8) and left the nation without the guidance of the Law (Hosea 4:6). The dictates of the Law became a 'strange' or 'alien' thing (Hosea 8:12) with all the prohibitions discarded in favour of a new liberalism which treated all men as equal in all respects. The Law prohibiting usury in the Israel context while permitting it in that of the 'stranger' soon lapsed and, as the Scriptures make abundantly clear, usury was rampant in Israel at the time of the captivities.

The Babylonian captivity of the southern kingdom of the house of Judah certainly did not purge these people of the pre-disposition toward accommodating strangers. Prior to the return from Babylon, the land became the domicile of un-named strangers (Ezekiel 33:24) who sought integration with the 42,360 of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin in the task of re-building Jerusalem (Ezra 4:1). The pressures exerted then finally won the day and once again the Law was flouted when the whole economic structure of the seventy weeks nation (Daniel 9:24) staggered under exorbitant interest rates which dominated all transactions (Nehemiah 5:3-13).

The Jubilee and Debt Release

Since that time, the whole world has been held to ransom by the financial strangle-hold that man's system has imposed upon it. Debt has piled upon debt with both king and subject held in a grip of iron from which there is no escape. The Law frowns upon *unnecessary borrowing*, for it is commanded that *'thou shalt not borrow'* (Deuteronomy 15:6) it being reprehensible to *'banquet upon borrowing'* (Ecclesiastes 18:33) or to build one's house *'with other men's money'* (Ecclesiastes 21:8). *"The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender"* (Proverbs 22:7). These latter statements derive from God's fore-knowledge that His Perfect Law (Psalms 19:7) would be abused - hence His warning of the consequences of this.

The perfection of the Law takes into account the fact that life has many variables and that despite a perfect Constitution individual initiatives change from family to family. When reference is made to the 'poor in the land', the cause of their status is not generally given. This is one of the variables against which the Law of release is provided. *"And at the end of every seven years there must be a cancelling of debts, and this shall be the way of cancelling. Every creditor shall cancel the loan he made to his neighbour or to his brother: he shall make no demand for repayment, because the Lord's release has been proclaimed. A foreigner you may press for payment, but whatever of yours was due from a brother you shall cancel. However, there should be no poor among you, for the Lord your God will abundantly bless you in the land He will give to possess as an heritage, if you listen to the Lord your God and rightly observe all these commandments which today I am enjoining upon you"* (Deuteronomy 15:1-6 Berkley version).

This Sabbatical year is referred to in three Books - Exodus 23:10-11; Leviticus 25:2-7 and Deuteronomy 15:1-6, and centres on two aspects of life in the economy of Israel. The first concerns the land which was to be rested with no cultivation of any kind to be practised during the year. The second involves the individual who, for unstated reasons has fallen into debt and which debt is then cancelled. A further release may be noted in the Jubilee, the fiftieth year after the succession of seven sabbatical years which was intended to check the tendency that might arise when the disposal of family inheritances to strangers was contemplated. *".... thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family."*

In this Jubilee which was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement, the God-prescribed liberty flooded the land heralding a new beginning with a clean slate and no bondage or debt. The soil was kept under the same condition of rest as had existed during the preceding sabbatical year while every Israelite returned to 'his possession and to his family' i.e., he recovered his right in the land originally allotted to the family of which he was a member. If, for some reason or other, an Israelite became a bondman and the period of seven years was not completed (no Israelite could be bonded for more than seven years because of the Sabbatical year of release - Exodus 21:2), the Jubilee released him in the overall liberty proclaimed throughout all the land.

DEBT AND THE JUBILEE RELEASE

*“The foxes have holes, and the birds have nests;
but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” (Matthew 8:20)*

Scriptural Realities

In this so-called financially-wise generation, such laws as those of the Jubilee Release of which we wrote in our previous issue, would be considered as economic suicide untenable in Twentieth Century civilisation. What men have to learn and what Israel has to accept is that God's Law does not depend upon men's consent or recognition. Over the past two hundred years certain events, particularly within the field of economics, have puzzled economists who have noted the regularity of recurring cycles and who have studied the problem from many angles with the view to countering it. In brief, these 'cycles' are called the 'financial high' and the 'financial low' - the 'high' being noted as a time of affluence while the 'low' is associated with hard times when the economy is depressed and recession hits the people. Business cycles are now an established and accepted phenomenon which, according to Paul A. Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is demonstrated when “national income, employment, and production fall. Prices and profits decline and men are thrown out of work. Eventually the bottom is reached and revival begins. The recovery may be slow or fast. It may be incomplete or it may be so strong as to lead to a new boom. The new prosperity may represent a long, sustained plateau of brisk demand, plentiful jobs, buoyant prices, and increased living standards; or it may represent a quick, inflationary flaring up of prices and speculation, to be followed by another disastrous slump”.

Distinct economic 'waves' have been discovered by economists who, in their preliminary investigations, established the recurrence of these waves as occurring just over seven years while the trough period i.e., the 'low' in economics, recurs 3.51 years after the peak. In attempting to explain the phenomenon, Samuelson contends: “Whether these long waves are simply historical accidents due to chance gold discoveries, inventions and political wars, it is still too soon to say”. Accidents do not happen with such regularity from which one may deduce that there is some design in the patterns which may be either warnings or a call to remember.

Apart from the seven year wave effect in economics, a Russian Professor at the Agricultural Academy and head of the Business Research Institute of Moscow, Nikolai D. Kondratieff, published a thesis in 1922 concerning what he called the 'long wave' in world economics. Analysing prices in Germany, France and the United States, trade in England and France and the production of coal, iron and other products throughout the world, Kondratieff came up with a fifty year recurring cycle. At the time of his thesis, two full waves had passed, the second being half completed in 1922. The first of these was noted as occurring in 1790, peaking in 1815 (twenty five years later) and then passing to the second which occurred in 1840. This 'wave' according to Kondratieff, peaked in 1866 to reach a low in 1890. The third 'wave' peaked in the years 1914-1920 from which period, Kondratieff contended a new low would follow.

Kondratieff was ridiculed by the Marxists in Moscow and in 1930 was arrested as the alleged head of an illegal anti-government Peasant's Labour Party and shipped to Siberia. However, the work done by this Russian is yet another confirmation of what Western economists have

come to recognise as pure economic fact. Economic waves certainly do exist - waves which are also detectable in all facets of national life. To project Kondratieff's work into the present day, one needs to look at life in general as it obtained in the Western world in 1920 - not only as it applied to finance, but as it revealed the system of ideas which developed after the war.

Malcolm Cowley, in *Exiles Return*, provides a graphic picture of those times in which he itemises eight distinct philosophies as comprising the whole. These were: (1) the idea of salvation by the child; (2) the idea of self-expression; (3) the idea of paganism; (4) the idea of living for the moment; (5) the idea of liberty; (6) the idea of female equality; (7) the idea of psychological adjustment; and (8) the idea of changing place. It should be noted that these eight features were characteristic features of the thinking as it obtained in Kondratieff's peak in 1920. Fifty years later the same thinking again manifests itself and is very real in the world of today.

Cowley's 1920 definition of 'Salvation by Child' was: "Each of us at birth has special potentials which are slowly crushed and destroyed by a standardised society and mechanical methods of teaching. If a new educational system can be introduced, one by which children are encouraged to develop their own personalities, to blossom freely like flowers, then the world will be saved by this new, free generation". In 1970, exactly fifty years later, Charles A. Reich in *The Greening of America* wrote: "School is intensely concerned with training students to stop thinking and start obeying. Any course that starts with a text-book and a teacher and ends with an examination runs this danger unless pains are taken to show students that they are supposed to think for themselves; in most school and college classes, on the other hand, thinking for oneself is actually penalised, and the student learns the value of repeating what he is told. Public school is 'obedience school'; the student is taught to accept authority without question". The 'youth cult' which emerged exactly fifty years after the idea in 1920 dominates the Western world today and should remind it that something is very definitely happening.

The second of the eight features in 1920 - the 'idea of self-expression' - was defined as the attitude in which each man's and each woman's purpose in life was to express himself or herself regardless of the impact of this on others. Today's expression 'do your own thing', born in 1970, tells its own story and needs no further elucidation.

The 'idea of paganism' in 1920 held that the body was a temple in which there was nothing unclean, indeed, a shrine to be adorned for the ritual of life. This philosophy again emerged after fifty years in which the young people, far from opposing Christianity, have simply turned away from it replacing it with mysticism and various forms of Oriental religions. The remaining five features which dominated the thinking of the 1920's - the 'idea of liberty', the 'idea of living for the moment', the 'idea of female equality', the 'idea of psychological adjustment' and the 'idea of changing place' needs very little elucidation as they all form an integral part of life as it was begun in 1920.

These 'waves' which are very definitely fact and not fiction must have some message for the present generation. The point is what? Is it purely coincidental that the financial cycles discovered by economists recorded a seven year recurring event? "And at the end of every seven years there must be a cancelling of debts?" The long 'waves' of Kondratieff's theory - the recurring cycle of fifty years - what does this mean? "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land?" God is not mocked nor was His Law given in vain. Anglo-Saxondom today is being reminded of these vital features in

the overall economy which God gave to His People as the source of their 'wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations'. God grant that His People might learn the lesson and respond to the urging of His Holy Spirit and embrace His Constitution which alone can bring peace, quietness and assurance for ever. The Cost of Democracy

The recurring economic cycles which, whether men like it or not, appear to follow the Biblical sabbatical year and that of the fifty-year Jubilee, continue to pour out their warnings of the need for constructive change within the present system. Change is of course the order of the day and yet, while men accept and encourage this within the political sphere and speak of the need for change within that of modern economics, they yet steadfastly refuse to abandon the Babylonian system and embrace that prescribed by God. They go even further. They vigorously oppose any suggestion that God is even remotely involved with such mundane things as modern economics - graciously allowing Him existence within the Church and then on the Sabbath day alone. Over the past one hundred and fifty years the world has passed ever deeper into the web of economic destruction occasioned by its commitment to a system which is the very antithesis of that given by God at Sinai. Tragically the Church remains ominously silent and politicians wander aimlessly amid the rubble of monetary and fiscal policies. "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth; neither is there any that taketh her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up" (Isaiah 51:18). It is no religious cliché to contend that all the modern ills in Anglo-Saxondom derive from the nation's departure from the Law of the Lord, nor is it intended as a lame apology to salve the human conscience - it is a political fact. One of the greatest dis-services perpetrated by the Christian Church is its persistent antinomianism - lawlessness - and the substitution of an undefined grace in place of God's discipline. The world is currently reaping the harvest from this act with anarchy, revolution, chaos and confusion tearing humanity apart in history's most prodigious wave of lawlessness. What man in general and ecclesiastics in particular have failed to appreciate is that grace is not the alternative to God's Law - lawlessness is the only alternative, an undisciplined, do-it-yourself type of society which recognises the human conscience as its only yard-stick - a yard-stick which varies from the sublime to the ridiculous. Men, both ecclesiastical and lay, have persistently rejected the political Reality of God and, in an age crying out for change in all spheres, stubbornly adheres to the 'traditions of men' which will not allow God the luxury of self-expression, nor will they accept that this is what the Bible is all about.

The Price of Democracy

For some strange reason, man in general has demonstrated a peculiar reluctance to have God reign over them. This fact was tangibly demonstrated in Israel, God's witness nation (Isaiah 43:10) which He formed to be a blessing to all the nations of the earth. Having been provided with countless demonstrations of God's Reality evidenced in His Providence for them in all spheres of life, God's Covenant People rejected His Sovereignty over them and opted for a democratic way of life in place of the theocratic rule. The cry of this separated, covenanted people to Samuel was: "... make us a king to judge (govern) us like all the nations" (1 Samuel 8:5).

It would serve a very useful purpose at this stage to note precisely how people were governed at that time, people with whom God's Nation demanded alignment. From the Encyclopaedia Britannica one is able to piece together the principles evolved by man in pursuit of his mandate to have 'dominion over the earth' (Genesis 1:26). Nations and empires were built on a principle which centred generally on the development of a central government, a

government created by the theory that the true lordship of the soil was vested in the state or the ruler on which the immediate occupant of the soil was dependent and to which a portion of the produce was due.

Thus, at a very early age one finds land nationalisation with ownership claimed by the government or the state with individuals, in typical modern socialistic vein, working for and owing everything to the state. During the eras of expansion and the development of empires, the same principle became operative with the land of the vanquished nations simply confiscated and re-allocated to individuals who would perpetuate the primitive form of socialism as it then obtained. A Biblical confirmation of this practice is to be found in 2 Kings 17:24 where the account of the king of Assyria's actions are recorded in which he placed 'men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel' From this, one is able to see the nature of Israel's demand of Samuel to 'make us a government like all the nations'. The Lord's reply to this demand was: "Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me that I should not reign over them" (1 Samuel 8:6). From this, it is patently obvious that socialism, even in its earliest form, was diametrically opposed to the Theocracy and indeed, embodied principles of government which were the antithesis of those laid down by the Lord.

Samuel was told to 'Hearken unto the voice of the people' and at the same time, the Lord metaphorically said: "Listen to the price you will pay for this exercise of democracy". A word-picture was then provided of a state of society with which the modern development of Israel in Anglo-Saxondom is very familiar today. The Lord warned that when human government was desired by His people - whether monarchical or through elected representation - the result would be the creation of a state of society which would engender the greatest insecurity and the exploitation of the people by those in authority. There would be no safe-guards for the individual. The whole pattern of the free-enterprise system would be transformed into a state-run monopoly. The land, the inalienable inheritance of each individual guaranteed under the Divine Constitution (Leviticus 25:10;23), would be expropriated by government (1 Samuel 8:14); the 'substance' of the people would simply be 'taken' without consultation or negotiation (verse 15); the freedom of pursuance of the vocation of individual choice would be denied with all becoming cogs in a gigantic state machine (verse 16) - all this was the warning of the Lord as to the consequences of rejecting Him and His Sovereignty over the people and when one considers what God offered to His people (Leviticus 26:3-13) as the reward for keeping His Law as against the price paid for the rejection of the Law, the nation's choice is not only ridiculous in the extreme, but stark tragedy.

Government and Authoritarianism

It will be noted that in His warning of the consequences attendant on their rejection of the Theocracy, the Lord indicated that the government or king would assume an authoritarian attitude - taking what it or he wanted without consideration of the people nor of their ability to meet the demands made. This, of course, has and is still happening and the people are undoubtedly becoming increasingly disenchanted with a system which is tyrannical in the extreme for it allows for no appeal nor does it tolerate any resistance. One is familiar with the farce which passes for democratic elections in the Western world just as one has become acquainted with the fact that once a representative is elected to parliament, he is no longer

answerable to the electorate, but becomes part and parcel of the 'prerogative' exercised by the government machinery which is now the master instead of the servant of the people. The noted British jurist, Sir William Blackstone (1723-80) drew attention to this subject when defining the word 'prerogative' as this was associated with the power of the monarch. He said: "... by the word prerogative we are to understand the character and power which the sovereign hath over and above all other persons, in right of his real dignity; and which, though part of the common law of the country, is out of its ordinary course". This 'prerogative' or the so-called 'divine right of kings' is that to which the Lord pointed when warning of the consequences of democracy in opposition to the Theocracy. It is, of course, absolutely true that in the case of the British Crown, the prerogative has been gradually limited by a long series of enactments - the Magna Carta, the Confirmatio Cartarum, the Prerogativa Regis, the Petition of Right, the Habeas Corpus Act, the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement - but the prerogative exercised by government is still nonetheless prodigious. It is of interest to note here the historical and far-reaching effects of the prerogative utilised by the British government in its dealing with the British colonies in the 18th century. As one reviews this era, God's warning in 1 Samuel 8 should be borne in mind as well as the fact that Britain is indeed the modern development of Ephraim, the Birthright tribe in Israel. In the middle of the 18th century, conflict was certainly the order of the day. In conjunction with the seven year war between France and Britain, a war was being fought on the Continent in which Austria, with its allies France, Russia and the German princes, attacked the new kingdom of Prussia with its sovereign, Frederick II. Britain joined Prussia and until peace was signed in 1763, found her treasury being depleted at an alarming rate. George Grenville became the British Prime Minister in that year and he immediately set about replenishing the treasury at the expense of the British Dominions claiming that, as the first minister in Britain, this was his right. Taxation at that time, was what may be termed as commodity taxation which went under a wide variety of names such as talliage, scuage, hydage, subsidies, aids, benevolences, tonnage and poundage, tolls, ship-money, tenths and fifteenths etc. All these were invoked by Grenville who saw however, that they would not suffice to fill the treasury and he then exercised an authoritarianism which had far-reaching effects. The mercantile system which had sprung up in Spain in the 16th century held that all colonies were to trade exclusively with the mother country - in that case, Spain itself to the exclusion of all others. Grenville applied this system to all colonial dominions acquired by Britain and through legitimate trade, was able to re-build the shattered finances of his country. This, however, was not achieved without certain resentment. Of all the British colonies, those in America were the most populous and important, their proximity to the Spanish colonies in the West Indies providing the basis for contraband trade. Grenville put a stop to this as much as lay in his power to do so. Obnoxious as was this authoritarian act, the colonists in America acknowledged the principle and accepted it without too much resistance. However, Grenville's further impositions created the embers of revolution when he claimed the right of taxation without representation. The British Parliament, he maintained, was the supreme legislature and as such, parliament had the right to raise taxes in America to support the military forces needed for the defence of that land. Accordingly, the 1765 Act, imposing a stamp tax on the American colonies was initiated. As was to be expected, the colonists resisted this - a resistance which reverberated across the Atlantic to bring William Pitt and George Grenville into conflict. Grenville insisted on the 'right' of the British Prime Minister to enforce the stamp tax while Pitt on the other hand, declared that the British Parliament had absolutely no right to tax the Americans. He did, however, add that in his opinion, the British government had the right to 'regulate' and therefore to tax the commerce of America for the benefit of the British merchant and manufacturer. Arising out of these two points of view, the British government took a middle course by repealing the Stamp Act, but also passing a

Declaratory Act in which the British Parliament was declared as the supreme power over the colonies in matters of taxation as well as in those of legislation. Scarcely had the measures relating to America been passed when George III dismissed the ministry giving William Pitt the responsibility of forming a new Government. In 1767, Pitt's mind gave way under the stress of disease and he was replaced by Charles Townshend who immediately applied the Declaratory Act and imposed duties on tea and other articles of commerce entering the ports of America. In 1773 the Bostonians had their famous 'tea party' at which they threw ship-loads of tea into the harbour rather than pay the obnoxious duty. In the following year, the Boston Port Bill deprived Boston of its commercial rights while the Massachusetts Government Bill took away from the colony the ordinary political liberties of Englishmen. War became inevitable, the first skirmish being fought at Lexington in 1775. In 1776, the thirteen American colonies united and issued their Declaration of Independence. The point behind this brief review of history is to indicate that the warning words of the Lord were indeed a portrayal of things to come - things which could and would obtain even within God's company of Israel nations. The authoritarianism, the taxation - these arose simply because God's People continued in their national blindness not realising that they did not need such economic theories as propounded by such as Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* - they had it made and ready to hand in the open Bible - the Law of the Lord. Oblivious to the remedy for the nation's ills, William Pitt, just prior to his death, introduced tax on income - or income tax - as an extraordinary war measure. This tax was later repealed for two years, re-imposed for another thirteen years, repealed again for the next twenty-six years and then re-imposed and is still operating today. It is, of course, impossible, nor does it come within the scope of this article to provide all the details of income tax which varies from country to country. However, in general, it will be noted that taxes are levied on ownership of land, houses and buildings, on the occupation of the land and on income derived from trade, professions and vocations. There are, of course, many other aspects of individual life which too are taxed, but those mentioned above will suffice for the moment to indicate that modern taxation, in all its ramifications, is devouring on average, over thirty-five percent of an individual's total income. (This was the figure some 20 years ago. Editor, F.D.) By Contrast - God's Taxation

Prior to considering the tax levied by the Lord, it is necessary to consider the indictment recorded in Malachi 3:8-9. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." It should be noted that the indictment here is national for the 'robbing' of God is done by the 'whole nation' - a feature which is missed by so many today. The question naturally arises as to how a nation can rob God? It is simplicity itself. The 'tithe' of course, is God's taxation - of which more presently - but what of the 'offering' which is also demanded of the Lord? The word 'offering' in this instance is derived from the Hebrew *terumah* which means lifted up on high and is used in the scriptural text as something presented to God Himself alone.

God's Covenant People today, by its involvement with the Babylonian system of economics, is robbing God of His witness to all the nations of the earth for His Promise, in response to national obedience to His economic Law is:- "... prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (Malachi 3:10). The modern development of Israel in Anglo-Saxondom is indeed 'cursed with a curse' for instead of reflecting the faithfulness of God to His word and being a prosperous witness nation under the blessing of God, it is wallowing in the mire of Babylonian economics and getting deeper into it with each passing

year. Anglo-Saxondom, as a company of nations, has 'robbed God' by its association with a system which is the very antithesis of that prescribed by Him.

God's system of taxation is limited to the tithe although a poll or head tax (Exodus 30:11-16) was levied on all males from the age of twenty and over. It is most strange that most Bible commentators fail to recognise the political significance of the tithe and by limiting it to the religious sphere have obscured a vital national machinery. It should be recalled that God was King in Israel (1 Samuel 8:7) and that from the time of the building of the Tabernacle, His Rule extended from this through the Levites. The Tabernacle, apart from being the ecclesiastical centre utilised on ceremonial feast days, was the everyday civil centre of the nation to which God's taxes - the tithe and head tax - was brought to be received by the Levites who administered these under God for the maintenance of society in all its phases. The point to note is that the tithe belongs to neither church nor state, but to God and is to be administered by those who do God's Work according to His Law.

The Law of the tithe is to be found in three Books of the Pentateuch - Leviticus 27:30-33; Numbers 18:21-26 and Deuteronomy 14:22-27; 26:12,15. These are however, not the first mention of the tithe in Scripture for Abraham tithed (Genesis 14:20) and Jacob certainly knew of it long before Sinai (Genesis 28:20-22). Basically, the tithe is divided into three parts, the first of which is one tenth - the Lord's tithe (Numbers 18:21-24) which went to the Levites (not the priests) who in turn rendered one tenth of this to the priests (Numbers 18:26-28). The function of the Levites was that of officers, judges, musicians and general custodians of the basic social functions within the nation which, it will be noted, was financed solely from the tithe. From this it is more than a little evident that the tithe places the basic control on society where it belongs - with the tithing people. Today, and under the authoritarian system, all social functions such as welfare and education have become the province of the state and are limited to what may be squeezed out of general revenue and are therefore of an uncertain and insecure nature. Under the Law of the Lord's tithe - which is not a gift to God but a tax for the use of the earth - a society is created which is not dependent upon grudging state assistance, but upon the Lord's blessing and faithfulness.

The second tenth is found to be the tithe used at three annual feasts and is rather elastic in its application. This tithe could be taken to the sanctuary in the form of money and the tither could spend it on himself during the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles and the Feast of weeks (Deuteronomy 12:6-7; 14:22-27). There was only one proviso to this tithe and that concerned the sharing of a portion with the Levites who too shared in the pleasure of the tither.

The third tenth was designed to assist the poor and was to be used locally for not only the poor, but the widows, the orphans, the helpless and strangers who, through a wide variety of circumstances, were unable to help themselves.

Tithing has, as history confirms, been in operation ever since it was first given as an integral part of Israel's national Constitution at Sinai, although its function gradually devolved into an ecclesiastical one with the national importance fading into obscurity. One is able to follow the process through the many historical works available, one of which by Joseph Bingham, "The Antiquities of the Christian Church", recording that "... the ancients believed the law about tithes not to be merely a ceremonial or political command, but of moral and perpetual obligation". Pictures of 'tithe barns' built in medieval England to house the tithe on produce paid by faithful farmers is another testimony to the continuing fact of the practised tithe.

However, as the world burst into the time of the end, the tithe was abolished - some through an Act of Parliament and others through a gradual neglect. During the Reformation, Protestant circles revived it, but this too has fallen into disuse, although still maintained as a supplement to Church income.

Modern Israel in Anglo-Saxondom. has indeed 'robbed God'. Apart from robbing Him of a national witness among the nations of the earth, it has stripped Him of His jurisdiction and His government and care in all departments of life. That which was supported by His tithe is now supported (very meagrely) by the state - the education which was controlled and supported by His tithe, is now the prerogative of the state which permits a wide range of ungodly subjects to replace basic Godly teaching. A new social order was born when the tithe fell away - an order which is convulsed with disorder and which cries out for change. And a change is surely coming for a new world order, based on the Divine Law of the Lord will transform the world. Make no mistake here. The state, whether a human monarch or an elected representative body, cannot bring peace, order and prosperity. This alone is God's Prerogative which when in operation, will surely bring full abundance of life to all the nations and families of the earth.

GOVERNMENT

The question as to how men should be governed, by whom and through what Constitution is becoming an urgent one for the trust of men - and here reference is to the situation in all Anglo-Celtic-Saxon countries - is no longer centred in the ability of elected representatives to cope with the overall national and international scene. It is no longer uncommon to hear the charge that once men are elected to government - and this on the basis of glowing promises of reform and reconstruction - both they and their promises recede into the common mould which projects an image of total hopelessness. This situation, of course, makes a mockery of the supposed principles on which the democratic system of government is based and more, it undermines the sincere endeavours of men of the past to provide for a just and equitable system by which a nation could be governed. In this, the fourth part Law of the Lord, the subject of government is examined side by side with God's instructions as to how His Israel people - as found in Anglo-Saxondom today - should be governed and, no matter how men may consider it, this Law of the Lord remains the only yard-stick for true peace and prosperity. Indeed, it has been disobedience and the ignoring of the Law which has brought about the present disastrous circumstances in the Western world today. Abraham Lincoln, in his 1863 Gettysburg address, made the famous speech which enshrined him within the hopes and ambitions of the American people. In this, he said: "That this nation, under God, shall.. have a new birth of freedom, and that the government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth". It should be noted that Lincoln never claimed to be original in his speech nor did he pretend that the political principle - the government of the people, by the people, for the people - was a new thing. In point of fact, the phrase had been used by President Monroe before Congress in 1820, by Schinz, a Swiss in 1830 and by Henry Wilson of Massachusetts in 1860. Then too, there is the tradition that this phrase with a preface - 'This Bible shall be for the government' - was incorporated in the Wyclif Bible of 1384 as well as the Hereford Bible of the same period. Extensive research into the tradition has however failed to either confirm or deny the validity of the claims. In Hoyt's Cyclopaedia of Practical Quotations, one finds that the phrase, as such, was used by Cleon, an Athenian demagogue (430 B.C.) who appealed to the masses not for their own good, but to further his personal prestige and ambitions. All down the centuries this phrase has been used - in some instances to overthrow authoritarian oppression and in others to undermine successful government and to establish mob rule. While a broad distinction is drawn between the Bible and Politics by many ecclesiastics today who encourage Christians to abstain from involvement in this, men of a past generation were not of this persuasion. They looked upon government as a God-given trust and did not hesitate to indicate that God's Word had much to say on the subject and demanded a return of the people, through government, to the principles of administration as laid down in the Bible. One such man was Charles Turner A.M., Pastor of the church in Duxbury, who was not only a man of tremendous conviction, but one who believed God and who saw, in the founding of the people in America, the 'planting of the Lord' (Isaiah 41:19) of His Israel people. In a sermon preached before the Governor, Thomas Hutchinson, and the House of Representatives of the Province of Massachusetts-Bay in New England in 1773, this being the anniversary of the election of the King's Council for that Province, Turner drew attention to the responsibility of elected government - which government should, at all times, be mindful of its mandate which originated from God. In the opening words of the sermon, Turner said: "As God condescends to govern the creation which He hath brought into existence, His dominion, though universal and absolute, is to be acknowledged as being, in its whole plan and numerous operations, unexceptionably wise and more . . . In His wisdom, He has chosen to use, in a great variety of

instances, the mediation of others, for carrying on the designs of His province. Agreeably, the civil rulers in this world, are in the numbers of His ministers or servants . . .” After setting out what was required of these ‘ministers or servants’ - not as it was conceived by man, but as demanded by the Lord, Turner ended his sermon by stating: “All persons, in any places of sacred trust, should exert themselves, according to the requirements of their several stations, to put a stop to the growing infidelity and immorality, whereby we provoke the Holy One of Israel to anger. Finally, may God grant that henceforth, our Government may attain the end of magistracy, the general happiness; that our officers may be peace, our exactors righteous; that judgment (and not innocent blood) may run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream; that this people (the branch of the Lord’s planting) may be all righteous, and inherit the land, in uninterrupted enjoyment of freedom, civil and religious, and all blessings of goodness for ever”. In those early days, men were imbued with a conviction that God meant precisely what He said and that it was not necessary to invent a social gospel to accommodate a political climate which relegated God to the limbo of spiritual experience alone. They saw God as the centre of national life and not an appendix added for the convenience of those who felt the need for spiritual refreshment. In those days, men believed God and in this belief gave Him all the Honour and Glory in national fruits of righteousness as laid down in His Holy Word. These men saw in the New Testament, a continuity of God’s Directives as He had given these at Sinai and were encouraged in this by noting the Lord Jesus Christ’s reaction, in a political context, to the traps set before Him. In one instance of this situation, attention is drawn to the account recorded by Matthew of the Herodians and Pharisees conspiring to discredit the Lord before both the people of Judaea and Roman authorities. They put the question to the Lord: “Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?” If the Lord answered this question in the affirmative, He would be denounced as a traitor to the writings of Moses and if in the negative, He could be and subsequently was, accused of ‘perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar’ (Luke 23:2). The Lord’s answer to the question is most illuminating in that it both negated the trap set for Him and provided for an understanding of the continuity of government as prescribed by God in the Old Testament. He called for the ‘tribute money’ and asked: “Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar’s”. This tribute money was probably the denarius which was in free circulation and which was part of the fiscal regulation of the Roman government in the context of poll-tax which had to be paid. Having received an answer to His question, the Lord said: “Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s” . As far as the immediate question posed by the Herodians was concerned, the Lord had answered in the affirmative in which He acknowledge the principle of the acceptance and use of the Emperor’s coinage as being an admission of his de facto sovereignty over them. At this time, the Roman government extended over the whole of the then known world and as this had been accepted with whatever benefits or otherwise resulted from this rule, obedience to the government and its dictates was essential. His subsequent statement however, makes it abundantly clear that there is an infinitely better government which, under the Sovereignty of God and by way of contrast with that operating under Roman jurisdiction, is preferable.

The Dictates of Government

The Lord said: “. . . render unto God the things that are God’s” and while many limit this statement to tithes and offerings - the whole situation arising out of the question relating to tribute money - the overall context indicates that it was not only the tribute money which was discussed, but obedience to the dictates of government. The prevailing government of that time had put its coinage into operation and having accepted and used this, all people placed

themselves under the system which was man-made with all the uncertainties and oppressions attendant on such a system. When the Lord called for a rendering of the things of God to God, He was making a special call - not to the Herodians - but to the whole body of Israelites who, although far from the land (Matthew 10:6), nevertheless still retained “. . . the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises” (Romans 9:4). ‘Render unto God the things that are God’s’ - the tithe was certainly the Lord’s, but the tithe was only a portion of the whole system of government which the Lord had given to one people - Israel. While men today may ask what other things, in addition to the tithe, one should render unto God, Moses, the great law-giver in Israel, provides the answer in that he draws attention to what the Lord required of the nation. He said: “And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, To keep the commandments of the Lord, and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good” (Deuteronomy 10:12-13).

Government Authorised by God

The requirement of God - that thing embodied in the Lord’s answer to the Herodians - was that Israel walk in His ways, to love Him and serve Him, both heart and soul. This reflects the heart of the purpose for which the Lord God made the nation Israel (Isaiah 43:1 & 21). It is interesting to note that prior to the Flood, no record exists empowering man to administer the Law, each individual being duty-bound to keep and observe the Divine Commands. Nowhere in the Bible is there any authorisation for human judgment against those who failed to keep the Law. The Biblical record of the antediluvian civilisation, while being sparse, nevertheless provides a graphic picture of licence which resulted from the exercise of free will without restraint in that it is stated: “The wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually . . . The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence” (Genesis 6:5; 12-13). While theologians today aver that no law is to be found prior to Sinai, one should note that the behaviour of men was construed as ‘wicked’ and that his thoughts were ‘evil’. Now ‘wickedness’ and ‘evil’ could only be understood if there had been a yard-stick which provided for ‘righteousness’ and ‘good’ - in other words, both ‘wickedness’ and ‘evil’ could only be charged as a violation of law. After the Flood, a new dispensation dawned in that a charter was provided authorising the Noahic family to administer the Law making it mandatory for them to exercise God’s Justice within the frame-work of Law transgression. “Whoso sheddeth man’s (aw dawm) blood by man (aw dawm) shall his blood be shed” (Genesis 9:6). This responsibility necessitated the formation of a governing body which, while being charged with the administration of the Law, had no power to enlarge the scope of its work, nor did it relegate to man the right of Law-amendment. It was simply an authorisation to implement the judgments as prescribed by the Law - in all other respects men were to remain powerless and devoid of authority to indulge in further legislation. In the post-diluvian era, the violence and crime of the ante-diluvian period gave way to violence and aggression by governments which in turn became the basis for the stringent commands of the Lord to the Israel nation concerning contact with the other nations. The instruction of Moses in this respect was: “When the Lord thy God shall cut off the nations from before thee, whither thou goest to possess them, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their land; Take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them, after they be destroyed from before thee; and that thou enquire not after their gods, saying, How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise . . .” (Deuteronomy 12:29-30). Because of the reference to ‘gods’ in this statement, many have thought that the whole prohibition falls in the context

of religious jealousy whereas nothing could be further from the truth. The prohibition is within the political context and is aimed at preventing the Divine system of government from being diluted by the incorporation of other man-conceived systems. The 'gods' of the nations with whom Israel came in contact, while served under various names, was basically Moloch who - in 1 Kings 11:7;33 - is written as Moloch or Milcom. While it is admitted that very little is known of Moloch, apart from the repeated references to him in the Scriptures as the god of the surrounding nations, the ancient practice of bestowing divinity upon kingship as a divine-human link between heaven and earth, is better understood. The practice in those days was that the king was presented to the people as a god and the god as a king and in this situation it is not difficult to appreciate the power exercise by the king. Being both a ruler and a god, the sovereign wielded authoritarian power with total jurisdiction in all spheres of individual and national life. A type of state-ism or totalitarianism with absolute power invested in the king whose whims and fancies became law, was the type of arena into which God's Israel people passed when they entered the land of Canaan.

Government of Administration

Having seen that the post-diluvian charter of administration devolved into violence and aggression by governments or human organisations which exceeded the charter given to Noah and his family, it is not surprising to find that the Lord God of Israel insisted on the provision of the administrative role of His people. In Exodus 19:5 it is stated: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation . . ." The word 'priests' is translated from the Hebrew and Arabic kohen which has a political as well as a religious meaning. In the various contexts in which this word is found, it will be seen to carry the meaning of administrators from which it may be seen that the Lord's intention with Israel, insofar as His Law was concerned, was that they would, upon obedience, become a kingdom of administrators or a people who would demonstrate the principle of government by administration and not government by legislation. As one passes on in the Law, it will be found that Moses, having provided the nation with God's Constitution, took it upon himself as leader of the people, to warn them against tampering with the Law. He said: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I commanded you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you" (Deuteronomy 4:2). This warning was repeated: "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it" (Deuteronomy 12:32). Thus, Israel, provided with the charter which established a government of administration with authority to implement the Divine Constitution given at Sinai, became a Theocracy indeed - a people ruled by God through the agency of His Divine Constitution. While the nation covenanted to be obedient to the voice of the Lord (Exodus 19:8), they nevertheless put into practice the principles of democracy which today still operates in their modern descendants in Anglo-Saxondom. Today, these principles are held to be the highest expression of political liberty with the people not realising that it is nothing less than the continued rebellion against God which characterised the behaviour of their forefathers in the land of Canaan. Democracy, which is the government of the people, by the people, for the people, has as the final court of appeal, public opinion, which, as pointed out in the Law of the Lord, should have no bearing or influence in the administration of the Constitution. The Lord's 'thou shalt not' took precedence over every opinion, whether private, public or the world. There is absolutely no provision in the Law for a national referendum to determine amendments to it; nor, as has been stated above, could any in the land, be he king, president or priest, add to or take away

any of the clauses in the Divine Constitution. The law of priestly ritual is another matter entirely, but insofar as the national Constitution is concerned, this being perfect (Psalm 19:7) cannot be improved upon nor is any attempt to change it to be tolerated. The first demonstration of the democratic tendency in Israel is to be seen when, notwithstanding the national commitment to obedience to 'all that the Lord hath spoken' (Exodus 19:8), they immediately demonstrated a desire to violate the words of God. While Moses was in the Mount, the people assembled themselves and demanded that their voice be heard with the result that Aaron acquiesced and built the Molten Calf establishing the rule of the people as against that of God. The sequel to this event should be read in Exodus 32:17-35.

Who Was to Administer in Israel?

It was patently obvious that the nation as a whole could not be relied on to function as the 'kingdom of administrators'. The tendency toward the democratic principle in the matter of the Molten Calf showed this without any doubt. Now, Moses had been called by God to be the organ of His Will in presenting the Law to the children of Israel and apart from this, no further office of authority in Israel was spoken of. It is true that Moses' father-in-law Jethro, suggested assistants in the prodigious task of 'judging' the people (Exodus 18:18-22), but it should be noted that notwithstanding the feasibility of this, God never endorsed its validity and proceeded, at a later stage, to initiate His own plan by investing judicial and executive powers in the princes of the tribes and the elders of the congregation (Numbers 11:14-17). It is interesting to note the limitations imposed on both the executives and the judiciary in Israel. In the first instance, executively the government (for this is what it was) was required to administer the Law, collect the tithes, establish the financial and monetary system, provide for national defence and security, attend to diplomatic relationships - all within the framework of the Constitution as provided by the Lord. Judicially, they were called upon to render just, equitable and impartial judgment in all matters which came before it. The judgments were laid down and no departure from these was sanctioned. While the 'princes of the tribes and the elders of the congregation' were invested with executive and judicial authority, the Lord made provision for what might be called the civil servants in the kingdom. In Numbers 8:18 the Lord states: "And I have taken the Levites for all the first-born of the children of Israel" and it will be noted that within this newly acquired status, the tribe of Levi operated and was responsible for all basic governmental functions. While speculation exists as to the reason behind the selection of Levi, it is patently obvious throughout the Scriptural record that this tribe had a special responsibility to preserve the Law of the Lord in all its integrity and purity and to see that its requirements were duly complied with. It is of course, quite common to hear the contention that the Levites were the priestly tribe which was given the responsibility of attending to the Tabernacle and that any suggestion of this tribe's association with things of a political nature was not to be found. Such reasoning does not take into account the fact that the patriarch Levi had 3 sons, Gershan, Kohath and Merari, Kohath being the grandfather of Moses and Aaron - Aaron being the progenitor of those whose chief function was to attend to the Holy Things of God. The remainder of the Levitical family was dispersed throughout Israel, having no land inheritance, but having four cities out of every tribe set apart for their use (Numbers 35:1-8). The tribe of Levi was thus strategically placed in Israel to accomplish its function which, in general, was to keep the nation on the straight and narrow.

Failure

That it failed is all too evident in the historical narrative, for in Judges 17:6 it is stated that ‘each man did that which was right in his own eyes’ - an indictment against the Levites who had obviously failed to keep the Law of the Lord before the people and as with Aaron before them, heeding the voice of the people which demanded a permissive type of society. To counter this situation, the Lord provided the Judges - none of whom came from the tribe of Levi - who were to operate in a role similar to that of Moses. Even this failed for in 1 Samuel 8 one finds the record of democracy in action in the rejection of the Theocracy and the popular demand for government similar to that obtaining in the surrounding nations. However, while a monarchy was provided in answer to the demands of the people, the Levitical tribe still retained its function, although as is obvious from the history of Israel, both the Aaronic line with its Sanctuary Service and the administrative section of the family allowed the Law of the Lord to lapse and the nation suffered the consequence of this departure from the only mechanism which would accomplish its God-prescribed destiny of ‘blessing all the nations of the earth’ (Genesis 18:18). The Old Testament closes with a tremendous indictment against the Levites in that it is stated: “But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at law; I ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore have I made you contemplate and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the Law” (Malachi 2:8-9). Thus, as has been seen, when the Lord called for a rendering ‘unto God the things that are God’s’, He was without doubt calling on Israel to return to the Law of the Lord and to render unto the Father, the Service for which the nation was formed.

Administrative Authority

“For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold the days come saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt . . . For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days . . . I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.” (Hebrews 8:7-10)

Great capital has, of course, been made of the fact that the Israel story in the Old Testament ended in apparent failure with men rejecting the Old Scriptures which they contend was and is the basis for the attempt to perpetuate a theocratic philosophy of Hebrew nationalism. Phrases which appear with monotonous regularity in many theological text books all point an accusing finger at the Law which they disparage as “unchristian” and which they reject as being totally incompatible with human conscience. While men may pass their judgment on the Law, the New Testament has a different story to tell in that, while it definitely underwrites the national tragedy of Israel in the Old Testament, it brings to the fore the law of cause and effect. It reveals, in the clearest of language, that a fault developed within the Israel polity and does not leave men to speculate where this fault lay. It categorically asserts that the sphere of law-operation is where the fault lay - within the nation itself and not with the Law. In the above-quoted Scripture, it will be noted that the first covenant was found to be faulty, but nowhere does it state that the Law suffered from the same deficiency. By observing what is actually written - in both the English translation and the Greek text - it will be seen that the first covenant was Israel’s undertaking in respect of obedience to the Law. This is where the break-down occurred for the Scripture states that the fault was in them (personal pronoun)

i.e., the Israel people who had covenanted to obey “all that the Lord hath said” (Exodus 19:8). That the fault lay in the national sphere of operation cannot be doubted for a generation later and despite the covenant of obedience, “every man did that which was right in his own eyes” (Judges 17:6). While the Scripture does not excuse the people for the violation of the covenant - indeed they paid the penalty for this in both the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities - special attention is drawn to the failure of the Levites, the civil administrators, who “corrupted the covenant of Levi” (Malachi 2:8) and who, as translated by Ferrar Fenton, “hated to look at my law” (verse 9).

Administrative Responsibility

In the world of today, men are doing exactly the same thing. They will not look at God’s Law which they consider as irrelevant and totally incompatible with the modern technological age of men’s creation. Within the ideology of the equalitarian dogma, all men are endowed with equal ability and in many instances, men are placed in administrative positions who have no ability in this field. It is small wonder that chaos reigns in both local and national government within Anglo-Saxondom. In Biblical times, when the Law was operative in Israel, different stations in life based on a man’s inherent capability, was the norm with no so-called “human rights” issue transforming a butcher into a politician. In the Apocryphal Ecclesiasticus 38:31-34, it is stated: “All these trust to their hands: and every one is wise in his work. Without these cannot a city be inhabited: and they shall not dwell where they will, nor go up and down: They shall not be sought for in public counsel, nor sit in the congregation: they shall not sit on the judge’s seat, nor understand the sentence of judgment; and they shall not be found where parables are spoken. But they will maintain the state of the world, and (all) their desire is in the work of their craft”. The context in which the above quotation appears is the wide spectrum of national commerce with workers in each facet gravitating to his own level of capability and projecting a dignity into the labour of his ability. The inequality of individual ability was thus an acknowledged feature of Old Testament life and was never considered as a political arena until the priestly office and that of the administrators indulged in legislative enactments which changed the Theocracy and made God’s Law “an alien thing” (Hosea 8:12).

THE APPLICATION OF THE LAW

In Biblical times, when the Law was operative in Israel, different stations in life based on a man's inherent capability, was the norm with no so-called 'human rights' issue transforming a butcher into a politician. In the Apocryphal Ecclesiasticus 38:31-34, it is stated: "All these trust to their hands: and every one is wise in his work. Without these cannot a city be inhabited: and they shall not dwell where they will, nor go up and down: They shall not be sought for in public counsel, nor sit in the congregation: they shall not sit on the judge's seat, nor understand the sentence of judgment; and they shall not be found where parables are spoken. But they will maintain the state of the world, and (all) their desire is in the work of their craft". The context in which the above quotation appears is the wide spectrum of national commerce with workers in each facet gravitating to his own level of capability and projecting a dignity into the labour of his ability. The inequality of individual ability was thus an acknowledged feature of Old Testament life and was never considered as a political arena until the priestly office and that of the administrators indulged in legislative enactments which changed the Theocracy and made God's Law 'an alien thing' (Hos. 8:12).

Evidence of this is to be found in the writing of Ezekiel the prophet who, in his 44th chapter, accuses the priesthood of allowing strangers (Heb: Nokriy) into the sanctuary and in the 34th chapter, records the Lord's indictment against the Levitical administrators who he calls 'shepherds'. These shepherds had obviously gone beyond the limits of the mandate of administration for it is stated: "But with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them" (Ezek. 34:4). In view of the generally accepted practice of each man doing that for which he was equipped, the question naturally arises as to the suitability of the tribe of Levi for administrative purposes and if not, why was this tribe singled out for this service?

The question is very difficult to answer - if it can be answered at all. What is known about the tribe is that it was taken 'for all the firstborn of the children of Israel' (Num. 8:18) and according to the Jewish Encyclopaedia, this selection could have resulted from the promise of Jacob recorded in Genesis 28:22. In this, the patriarch promised the 'tithe' to the Lord and, calculating the number of the sons of Jacob from the youngest i.e., Benjamin, Levi was the 'tenth' and therefore set aside for the Lord's use. Be that as it may, it is patently obvious that Levi was not suited to the task of national administration.

Apart from their function in the various departments of national life, the main responsibility lay in keeping the people acquainted with the national Constitution under which they operated. "At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger (Heb: ger; legal sojourner) that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord thy God, and observe to do all the words of this law: And that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God" (Deut. 31:10-13).

This, of course, falls within the scope of education - national education - in which the centrality of God and His Constitution is emphasised. It will be noted that the responsibility of the Levite administrators to 'read the law before all Israel' occurs in the year of the cancellation of debts - the year of release - the cornerstone of the whole national economy. It was a reminder to the nation, now debt-free and thus poverty-free, that its national well-being

resulted from its obedience to the Constitution provided by the Lord. While the tangible reality of the political significance of the Law was thus demonstrated, the whole purpose in the Levitical function on that day was to establish the principle that 'happy is the nation whose God is the Lord'. However, against the background of economic restitution, the Levites were instructed to ensure that the future generations too could enjoy the fruits of national obedience to the Constitution.

As must be obvious, under this Theocracy, obedience was the key-note and equally obvious is the fact that it was in this department that the administrators fell down. The rejection of God as King - the intrusion of the democratic principle of government of the people by the people - all this attests to the failure of the Levites to honour their responsibility as administrators to God's witness nation.

Obedience Required

It is one of the most outstanding features in the Divine Constitution that the higher the position in the nation, i.e., king, administrator, judge or priest, the greater was the demand for obedience to the Law. Prior to the failure of the Levitical administration and before the people succumbed to the enticement of human government as manifest in the neighbouring nations, the Lord had made provision for the retention of His Law within the framework of the nation's rejection of His Kingship (1st Sam. 8:7). 'When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me like as all the nations that are about me; Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, who the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren (Heb: 'ach; literal blood relationship) shalt thou set over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger (Heb: nokriy; one of incestuous or spurious origins) over thee, which is not thy brother" (Deut. 17:14-15). From this, it is apparent that rulership or government in Israel was by Divine appointment and not the free exercise of democratic elections of alien peoples to administrative responsibility in the nation.

"And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests (Heb: kohen; administrators) the Levites: And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord thy God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them" (Deut. 17:18-19). From this is established that governing authority is not above God's Law, and that no matter who ruled the nation or was involved with administration, they were at all times obliged to observe the national Constitution as the ultimate authority.

The Application of the Constitution

As with the appointment of the Levites to the position of administrators, so too one finds the appointment of judges to "Hear the causes between your brethren, and to judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him" (Deut. 1:16). To these judges was committed the responsibility that "Thou shalt not wrest judgment (distort justice), thou shalt not respect persons (regard social status), neither take a gift (bribes); for the gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of righteousness. That which is altogether just shalt thou follow, that thou mayest live, and inherit the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Deut. 16:19-20). The office of the judge was thus clearly theocratic for the Law having been given by the Lord, his task was to apply this to the conflicts of life as these arose within the experience of the individual.

In the Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus noted that the judges were at all times assisted by the Levites for, in quoting the legal procedures as laid down in God's Law, he wrote: "Let there be seven men to judge in every city, and these such as have been before most zealous in the exercise of vir-tue and righteousness. Let every judge have two officers allotted them out of the tribe of Levi. Let those that are chosen to judge in the several cities be had in great honour; and let none be permitted to revile any others when these are present nor carry themselves in an insolent manner to them..." Thus the office of administration of justice had, at all times, immediate recourse to the Law against which all judgments were made.

In the administration of justice, it was the responsibility of the Levites to ensure that the judges acted within the Law which recognised no differentiation in the status of the individual and had absolutely no regard for wealth, position or power. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked. And it shall be, if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number" (Deut. 25:1-3). In this, as is obvious, one may see that the judgment of 'beating' was to be meted out to the 'wicked' and it mattered not if he was a wealthy noble in the land or whether he was a humble blacksmith - the judgment was the same for both as was the humiliation.

The Criminal

It may, of course, be claimed that the judgments recorded in the Israel Law, while being appropriate and suitable for Old Testament conditions, do not conform with advancements made in modern civilisation. It should be stated however, that notwithstanding the wide gulf in time which separates those days from the present, the principle of judgment remains the same and is thus fundamental to any well-ordered society. In today's society, large institutions are built at the expense of the tax-payer in which the emphasis is on the rehabilitation of the criminal - which rehabilitation is paid for out of taxes paid by the person against whom the criminal act was perpetrated.

In the Divine Law, the community is not burdened with the additional cost of constructing and Maintaining of prisons. There is only one judgment where imprisonment as such was provided for and this arose out of accidental killing or homicide. Any person accidentally causing the death of another, automatically fled to a Levitical city of refuge where he remained until released by the death of the high priest (Num. 35:6,13,15; Jos. 10:2,7,9). In many instances this amounted to life imprisonment, but a sentence very different to the similar judgment in the present modern era. Murder, of course, is an entirely different matter.

The Death Penalty

Contrary to popular modern belief, the God of the Old Testament does not hold life cheaply. The taking of a life is so serious in His eyes that He demands that the murderer forfeit his life, and in Numbers 35:31 it is stated: "Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall surely be put to death". God's judgment for murder is thus death, but man, who thinks he knows better, has invented his humanistic device of the prison system which too will soon pass to become the mental institution and psychiatric retraining and rehabilitation centre. Man's experimentation is certainly not diminishing crime, nor is it creating respect for human life. Conversely, God's Law and its judgments are aimed at reinstating respect for the dignity of human life. The judgment of

capital punishment - indeed all His judgments have this end in view "... so that thou put the vile away from among you. And those which remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more such evil among you" (Deut. 19:19-21).

Among the crimes for which the death penalty was mandatory are (1) murder (Ex. 21:12-14); (2) striking or cursing a parent (Ex. 21:15; Lev. 20:9); (3) kidnapping (Ex. 21:16; Deut. 24:7); (4) adultery (Lev. 20:10-21); (5) incest (Lev. 20:11-12,14); (6) bestiality (Ex. 22:19; Lev. 20:16); (7) ho-mosexuality (Lev. 20:13); (8) habitual criminality (Deut. 21:18-21); (9) blasphemy (Lev. 24:11-14) and (10) refusing to abide by the court decision and thus denying the Law (Deut. 17:8-13).

The Thief

In the case of theft, conviction resting upon established guilt and this arrived at by the testimony of two or three witnesses (Deut. 19:15), demanded multiple restitutions according to the circumstances of the case. "If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep" (Ex. 22:1). Conversely, "If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall restore double" (Ex. 22:4). Today a person convicted of the above charges is merely sent to prison and the person suffering the loss left without physical restitution - the satisfaction of the conviction being an empty tribute to justice as a man sees it. In the Divine Law, the loss of the sheep through theft and death deprived him of his immediate as well as future wealth for the commercial value of the animal plus its reproductive value were assets to him. The restitution ratio of four to one was therefore an adequate compensation. The five to one ratio of the stolen ox took into account the added feature of an ox as a beast of burden and one which had a wide variety of tasks in a man's every day economy of life. The compensation was therefore commensurate with the animal's function.

The Community

While certain judgments were stipulated for specific crimes perpetrated by individuals, the Law held cities responsible for crimes committed within its borders when those responsible for the crime were not punished. The community was required to make atonement for the crime which produced a civic consciousness of community responsibility and made for the strict enforcement of the Law (Deut. 21:1-9). In this one may see that the individual within the community becomes a law-enforcement officer in that he is forbidden to be a bystander in any situation governed expressly by the Law.

"Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox nor his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them; thou shalt in any case bring them again unto thy brother" (Deut. 22:1). Lost or strayed animals, indeed all of a man's possessions were to be protected under the Law and to be held in ward with every public effort made to afford an immediate restoration of that which had been lost - a civic responsibility engendered by the Law. Likewise in the case of public morality. A woman assaulted in a city without raising a cry of alarm is considered to have given her consent to the assault and therefore subject to the penalty of whoredom - death (Deut. 22:24). How-ever, having raised the alarm, it was the duty of every man within the sound of her voice to act and render assistance. In today's society, a cry for help is invariably ignored with many simply stepping over the body of the victim. In Anglo-Saxondom, communities are filled with bystanders who watch with superficial interest as lawlessness, crime and tragedy parade before their eyes and no finger is lifted to halt the erosion.

"When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him; and has been partaker with adulterers" (Ps. 50:18). The inactive bystander, apart from his failure to observe the requirements of the Law, renders himself liable to the judgment prescribed from the crime committed. Like the perjurer, he becomes an accomplice and an accessory to the crime (Deut. 18:18-19) and liable to the penalty. Thus community responsibility is clearly defined and indeed demanded of the individual who contributes by enforcing the Law and thus contributing to the well-being of all within the city limits.

The king, the judge, the Levite and the individual all have their part to play in the functioning of a flourishing community - indeed all are inter-dependent. However, as the Bible makes abundantly clear, men appropriated to themselves positions for which they were not qualified, while others, under the pretext of guarding public morals abused civic responsibility in furthering their own ends. This point is graphically illustrated in the New Testament - in the account of the women taken in adultery (John 8).

The scribes and Pharisees, no doubt invoking the civic responsibility clause in the Law of the Lord, dragged the woman who had been caught in the act of adultery before the Lord asking that He judge the woman in terms of the Law (John 8:5). The hypocrisy of the Pharisees was exposed by the Lord for by this time adultery had become such a common practice that the prescribed judgments had long since fallen into practical oblivion. In the first instance, there were recognised judges in the city before whom the woman should legally have been taken and yet they brought her to the Lord. He refused to act as judge. In place of this, He acted within the framework of the Law as it was originally given prior to its pollution and perversion by those who, at that time, had usurped the Israel name and function. It will be noted that the Lord, "stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he hear them not" (John 8:6). What did He write? The Scripture does not say, but one is not left to speculate for, as throughout His whole Ministry, the Lord Jesus Christ pointed to the Law and its requirements and judgments. In this instance, He drew attention to the trial of bitter water or the water of conviction recorded in Numbers 5:11-31.

In this Law, the accused woman having been brought to the tabernacle, the priest then took 'holy water in an earthen vessel' and put 'of the dust of the floor of the tabernacle into the water'. The woman was then charged with the crime after which the priest gave the water to the woman to drink which, if she were innocent, nothing happened, but if she were guilty, she fell under the penalty - her body reacting in such a way as to establish her guilt.

It will be noted the Lord was in the temple when they brought the woman to Him and as He stooped and wrote in the ground, was this not the 'dust of the floor of the tabernacle'? Thus writing in the dust, the Lord met the requirements of the Law but He did more. He placed the accusers on trial for preferring charges against the woman, the scribes and Pharisees acting, in terms of the Law, in the husband's role. By writing in the dust, the Lord placed them in this category by invoking the Law in Numbers 5. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." That the accusers knew that the Lord knew of their adultery as well, was all too evident, for having placed them (legally) in the role of the woman's 'hus-band' and as they were also guilty of adultery, their just due was death as well. It is small wonder that they went out 'one by one' with none left to press home the charges of adultery against the woman.

It should be noted here that the Lord had confirmed the death penalty for the woman and so there is no question about her guilt - had He not invited the first stone to be thrown in the death sentence? However, in judgment of this nature, the Law demanded 'two or more

witnesses'. These were missing and so as Jesus Himself had not witnessed the act, He said to her: 'Go, and sin no more' (John 8:11).

The Man Born to Be King

It will be noted, if one is able to throw off the opiate of modern re-ligious teaching, that the First Advent was the direct result of national rebellion against the Sovereignty of God in all its phases - a vindication of the law of cause and effect. This principle dominates the whole body of revealed Scripture and as one considers the Messianic prophecies these will be recognised as God's response to the deteriorating national situation in Israel arising from the national alienation from God's Constitution.

Isaiah, truly one of the most prolific writers in the context of Messianic prophecies, went to great lengths in clarifying the reason behind the Virgin Birth which, he contended, was a 'sign' to Israel of Divine intervention in the tragedy of national disintegration (Isa. 7:8-14). Referring to the state of darkness which had descended upon the nation, he then wrote of the Child born to be King Whose government would emanate from the 'throne of David' (Isa. 9:6-7) thus indicating the correction of the national malfunction of Israel. There are indeed few people who are not familiar with the prophet's fifty-third chapter which records the suffering of the Messiah, but how many are there who realise that Isaiah, in drawing attention to the consummation of the First Advent, was stating as its immediate priority, the ending of Israel's then rebellion against the Sovereignty of the Lord? The prophet wrote: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities...for the transgressions, of my people was he stricken" (Isa. 53:5-8). The use of the personal pronoun 'our' and 'my' by the prophet certainly denies the modern teaching of universalism and indicates the prophet's limitation of the First Advent to those whose transgression and iniquity was an impediment to the Plan and Purpose of God.

Transgression

To fully appreciate Isaiah's attitude, the subject of 'transgression' should be noted. In the Hebrew text, the word translated as transgression in the Authorised Version is *pesha* or *pasha* which has no other meaning than rebellion or breaking away from the rule of authority. It is patently obvious that to the Israelite Isaiah, the tragic situation in his own people, resulting from the continued violation of God's Law, was a rebellion against the Authority which alone gave context and meaning to his people. Thus, if one removes the English translation from the text replacing it with the more correct 'rebellion', one is able to see the picture of Messianic prophecies, not as a series of unconnected events, but as the deliberate action of God in Redeeming His people Israel and liberating them from the bondage of the then permissive society and bringing them once again into the true liberty which is afforded by His Law.

Another such confirmation is to be found in the writing of Daniel who recorded the angelic explanation for the 'seventy weeks' mandated pe-riod provided for his - Daniel's - people. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression..." (Dan. 9:24), the word 'transgression' again being the English translation of the Hebrew *pesha* which, as the consideration of Isaiah's writing has shown, means 'rebellion'. It will be noted in reconsidering Daniel's writing that the 'transgression' is not a generalisation, but has the definite article preceding it thus indicating a specific rebellion and not a universal one. The cause therefore, for the First Advent - if one accepts the integrity of

the prophets which the Lord Himself placed above reproach (Luke 16:31) - was Israel's insubordination and secession from God's Constitution which brought His Covenanted Purpose and His Holy Name into jeopardy.

Into the New Testament

While men may dispute the fact, it is nevertheless true that teachers in Anglo-Saxondom have extended the Old Testament rebellion against God into today's doctrines in that they have transposed what is actually written in the Scripture to make God's Word conform with man's emotional and intellectual requirements. For instance, they refuse to accept what is written in Matthew's Gospel, preferring a spiritualised version of the angelic annunciation to Joseph concerning the Child born to Mary. The Scripture relates the instruction; "... fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:20-21). The phrase 'his people' is universalised to take in all people at all times - an interpretation which makes nonsense of the scriptural definition of 'sin' (1st John 3:4). Further, it ignores as though it was not written, the explanation by the angel who stated that the Birth of the Lord was the fulfilment of the Isaiah prophecy and which, as has been seen, was provided as the effect resulting from the cause of Israel's departure from God's Constitution.

Luke's account of the annunciation to Mary is perhaps the most potent of all in that Gabriel emphasised the Kingship of the Son to be born to Mary - a Kingship which is not stated as being universal, but specifically limited to the house of Jacob. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Sons of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32-33). If, as so many teachers today aver, the Law of the Lord has been replaced by 'grace', through what instrument will the King rule? The whole picture of the end of the age with its turmoil, chaos, confusion and violence indicates that the Second Advent of the Lord is a necessity in which the King is coming to enforce His Kingship in Israel. The parable of the 'wheat and the tares' (Matt. 13:24-30) makes this abundantly clear and one should not eulogise about a 'gospel of love' bringing about a universal society of peace. The principle of the rule of the Lord was stated by John the Baptist who said: "And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire" (Matt. 3:10; Luke 3:9).

The Call for Reformation

God's Law was the cornerstone of the Lord's Ministry for He Who was 'made under the law' for the express purpose of 'redeeming them that were under the law', by no suggestion or implication provided any thought that He supplanted the Law with grace. Throughout His Ministry, the Lord called for a reformation, a reconstruction of the faith once delivered to the fathers which was based on obedience to God's "voice, charge, commandments, statutes and laws" (Gen. 26:5). The need for this was patently obvious. Aliens had already insinuated themselves into a role for which they were not fitted and having violently assumed an identity which was not theirs (Matt. 11:12), the usurpers were projecting their religious and civil traditions as a vital and necessary development of the Old Law in conformity with the then modern trends. Under the pretext of 'modernisation', the Pharisees gave priority to tradition over the Law - tradition which then, as with today, became a perversion of God's Holy Constitution. As must be obvious, despite the reformation demanded by the Lord, His true

Israel people have persisted as proselytes to Pharisaism or its modern counterpart Judaism and steadfastly refuse to 'have this man to reign over us' (Luke 19:14).

It should be clearly understood today that the Lord Jesus Christ did reject law - He rejected every law and every tradition except those given by the God of Israel at Sinai for did He not say: "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up" (Matt. 15:13)? Did He not also say: "Think not that I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:17-18)? Because of the ambiguity of the English translation of these words, many have been tempted to utilise this text as a justification for the non-observance of the Law. However, a closer look at the Greek text will show this is to be a vain exercise in wishful thinking for the very opposite emerges.

The key-word in the relevant verses is 'fulfil' which to many has come to mean a completion or an ending. This being so, an examination of Greek text becomes necessary for if the Lord ended the Law, His subsequent actions and statements make Him at variance with Himself. The Greek word translated as 'fulfil' is *pleroo* which is derived from *pleres* which means to 'make full to the top, to cause to abound or to pervade'. Throughout the New Testament, one finds this word dominating situations which, as the context reveals, confirms the abovementioned definition and indicates something being made full and being maintained. Thus literally, the Lord said that He had come to put the Law into force and to keep it in force in opposition to the traditions of men. In verse eighteen, the word 'fulfilled' is translated from the Greek *ginomai* which means 'to become, cause to be, happen'. In point of fact, what the Lord said was that, far from abolishing the Law, He had come to put God's Law into force until it permeated all Israel causing it, God's National Witness, to function as had been intended in the first instance.

The Law in Operation

Prior to His Instruction on the Mount and serving as an added emphasis to His call for reformation and return to the Law of the Lord, the Lord Jesus Christ provided a tangible illustration of the efficacy of the Law. It will be recalled that immediately prior to His first adult public appearance, the Lord triumphed over six satanic temptations, all of which required a declaration of independence from God and His Law. In each of the temptation, the Lord's defence was: "It is written" - a phrase which leads one back to the Law of the Lord in every instance. The Greek word translated as 'written' is *gegraptae* which at that time was in daily use and had a legal significance. The practice in those days was that when two men wished to enter into a contract, they drew up the terms of this and then proceeded to an officer of the court who, after reading the contract to both parties, wrote *gegraptae* across the contract indicating that it had been duly attested and none could alter any jot or tittle of the document. In the context of the Lord's usage of the word against Satan's temptations, one understands anew the significance of the Law in that the Constitution having been given, it was unalterable with no power in heaven and earth able to change one word of its content.

The tempter said to the Lord: "... command that these stones be made bread" (Matt. 4:3) and the answer came back: "It is written (*gegraptae*), Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God". This was a direct quote from Deuteronomy 8:3 where Moses warned the children of Israel against violation of the Law. "And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness...And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna,

which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee to know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live" (Deut. 8:2-3). Again the tempter said: "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone". Again the answer came back: "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God", another quote from the attestation of the Law recorded in Deuteronomy 6:16. When the tempter offered the Lord all the kingdoms of his satanic system with their allurements as the reward for worshipping him, the Lord's answer was once again: "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" - a direct quote from the First Commandment recorded in Deuteronomy 5:7. One is thus able to see that the Lord's sure defence against the evil of temptations was the Law of the Lord which was and is unalterable, unchangeable and efficacious in the extreme. If it was sufficient for Him, how dare men today claim it to be inefficient, archaic and obsolete?

The Instruction on the Mount

A point which has escaped the attention of many today is the fact of the similarity between Moses and the Lord Jesus Christ in the matter of Law pronouncements. Moses, it will be recalled, received the Law of the Lord from the mountain in Sinai and from its slopes transmitted this to Israel. In Deuteronomy 18:18 Moses recorded the words of the Lord Who promised that He would raise up a Law-Prophet like unto Moses Who would teach the Lord's commandments to the people. Is it purely coincidental that the Lord Jesus Christ utilised mountains on at least two occasions to establish His alignment with the Law of the Lord?

In the first of these in which He declared Himself as King and Lawgiver, He declared the Law from the mount and in which the only change which is evident is that Moses' preface to each aspect of the Law - "Thus saith the Lord thy God" is replaced by "I say unto you". This is a change only in phraseology and not in personality for it was the same Authority - the Word - Who gave the Law to Moses Who now asserted His Identity in the simple statement: 'I say unto you'. What, in fact did He now say? Fully conversant with the perversions resulting from the 'Traditions of men' which the Pharisees insisted were inseparable from the Law, the Lord developed the full implications of this in calling for a reformation and return to the spirit as well as the letter of the Law.

The Lord and Murder

The first of the Lord's references in what is commonly but mistakenly called the Sermon on the Mount, has to do with 'killing'. "Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whoso-ever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment..." This, of course, is a reference to the sixth Commandment which literally means: "Thou shalt do no murder" - the word 'kill' being an unfortunate translation of the Hebrew ratsach. What the Law actually states is that unjust violence against a brother is definitely forbidden, whereas legitimate warfare, capital punishment and self-defence are not. The Lord, in drawing attention to this Commandment used the Greek equivalent to the Hebrew ratsach which was phoneuo and which, as indicated by the Hebrew word, meant murder or unjust violence. One is thus able to see that the Lord changed nothing, for judgment was still applicable and unjust violence - this case murder - had only one reward - death.

The Lord and Adultery

The Lord's second specific reference to the Law involved the Seventh Commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" - the Hebrew *naaph* carrying the meaning of debasing, corrupting and rendering counterfeit. The punishment for this in the Law was death and by no hint or suggestion did the Lord abrogate the judgment. The thought as well as the act of adultery came under a similar judgment for human nature being what it is, the thought is indeed the father to the deed.

The Lord and Divorce

Against the loose practices which had developed as the result of Pharisaic traditions, the Lord then drew attention to the biblical Law of Divorce and in which He altered nothing which was not in Deuteronomy 24. "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery..." The word 'fornication' in this instance is translated from the Greek *pornea* which has as its primary meaning, incest. However, there are other shades of meaning to this word which are covered in the Old Testament Laws concerning grounds for divorce. Persons were divorced by the death of one of the partners - a death by execution for transgression in offences which carried capital punishment. For instance, death was mandatory for women who revealed unchastity before marriage (Deut. 22:21); for adultery after marriage (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:22-23) for prostitution (Lev. 21:9) and for incest (Lev. 20:11-17). Women, on the other hand enjoyed equal rights in divorce by death for homosexuality (Deut. 22:20); rape (Deut. 22:25-26) and kidnapping (Ex. 21:6) are obviously masculine and warrant the death penalty which automatically divorces the woman from the man.

Mixed Marriages

Another type of divorce may be enforced by the authorities which covers mixed marriages which were prohibited by the Law. In this context the following may be read: (Deut. 7:1-3; Ex. 34:12-16; Num. 25:6-8). However, the Lord Jesus Christ specifically pinpointed the type of divorce which involved the writing of the 'bill of divorce' (Deut. 24:1-4). Israel, it will be noted was given a bill of divorce (Jer. 3:8) and the principle involved here was that to which the Lord made references contrasting this with the loose excuses evolved by the Pharisees and practised in that day.

Uncleanness

The bill of divorce in Deuteronomy was valid only when some 'uncleanness' was found in the wife. As will be seen, this 'uncleanness' could apply to the man as to the woman. Israel, as the wife of Jehovah, was divorced because of apostasy, unfaithfulness, secret treachery under the guise of sincere and faithful obedience. The nation refused to heed God's Law seeking its own directives while still retaining a facade of piety in its observance of the Feasts of the Lord. She became a divorced wife because she disobeyed the authority of her husband Who was both a Covenant and Law keeper. This is the 'uncleanness' which alone warrants the 'bill of divorce'. It was this principle to which the Lord on the Mount drew attention reforming the Law in conformity with its original context.

Throughout the whole of the instruction on the Mount one finds, as one searches, that not a single jot or tittle of the Law was altered - indeed it could not be, for as He had stated, He had come to make the Law of the Lord abound and so permeate the people to whom it was an integral part of their mission. It was this Law, pure and unadulterated which was to be written in the heart and mind of His people in terms of the New Covenant and it was this Law which is to go forth from Zion and to establish a witness to which nations and people can flock (Mic. 4:1-5). This is indeed 'tidings of great joy' which should be taught at a time when violence, crime, chaos and confusion stride through society taking their toll in misery and suffering.

Disaster is undoubtedly increasing throughout the world today and the true Israel people, as found in the Anglo-Saxon and kindred people of the West, should remember what the First Advent was really all about.

If they insist on calling themselves Christians, then it is time they followed the example of He whose Name they have taken. It is time they reinstated the Law of the Lord as a way of life and a nation's constitution.

THE LAW, THE FAMILY AND IDENTITY

“Honour thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath, commanded thee: that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee”. (Deut.5:16).

It is an incontestable fact that the present time is one of rampant revolution which convulses the whole creation, leaving none exempt from the insecurity engendered by this modern plague. Because of the publicity given to this subject by the communication media, revolution has come to be accepted as the legitimate means of achieving one's objectives and few are prepared to recognise the situation as it really is. For example, who questions the motives behind the so-called emancipation of women in Women's Lib? How many are interested enough in enquiring into the reason behind the revolution of youth which is euphemistically referred to as the 'generation gap'? Why has the male generation been emasculated of his authority and traditional position as head of the family? From the purely philosophical point of view, the answer to these questions is an evolutionary one which, while not satisfying, has this virtue in indicating an awareness that a situation does exist which is out of the ordinary. However, recognising the existence of a situation and merely defining it as an evolutionary trend is cold comfort to those who suffer the consequences of the erosion of all the principles upon which twentieth century civilisation has been built. It is cold comfort indeed to those families which are shattered by the impact of the revolutionary era and who view the future with a hopelessness born of despair. Diagnosis is not a cure, just as definitions of malady fail to remove them. It is in this context that the following is offered not as a palliative to the prevailing situation, but as a directive toward the regaining of the dignity of identity and re-establishment of structure within the homes of Anglo-Saxondom. In this present revolutionary age, the general emphasis is undoubtedly centred on a break with the past - a rupture of the discipline or structure which, while not being perfect, was infinitely better than the self-centred permissiveness which highlights the behavioural patterns in today's society. From both the political and the religious aspects, one is treated to an overdose of propaganda which invariably contends that the past is irrelevant, the present transitional and only the future reality or, in other words, it doesn't matter where one comes from so long as one knows where one is going. If ever there was a contradiction in terms, this is it. Who, be he an intellectual or moron, can say with any degree of certainty, precisely where he is going? The future, based on a projection of current trends, is as obscure as the proverbial pool of mud. One of the most vicious aspects in this attempt to break with the past is to be seen in the children who are encouraged to turn on their parents in open animosity and positive rebellion. In this so-called liberty from the past, the children are not told that their action is a self-destructive one in which, in point of fact, they disinherit themselves. The child inherits life from his parents and while they come into the world naked, they do not come into a desolate world. The homes, the fields, the amenities of life, the love and care of father and mother - all these are provided as an inheritance, the continuity of which is jeopardised in the revolution of youth which is prepared to discard all this in favour of some uncertain future.

A Deliberate Campaign

One wonders if Anglo-Saxondom - for this is the specific arena in which the great drama is being enacted - realises that their present situation is a manipulated one and that from 'Women's Lib' to the revolution of youth, each step is part of a carefully planned conspiracy

aimed at self-destruction. To many, this statement will be dismissed as pure fantasy or the product of an over-active imagination - but is it? Examine for a moment the general trend throughout the world - the trend toward statism or state control in all aspects of life. Private enterprise which is synonymous with private property is slowly but surely being phased out of existence with the state - no matter whether in the East or the West - exerting more and more control in those departments of life formerly considered as the prerogative of the individual. Private property or private enterprise is the outgrowth of that time-honoured institution called the 'family' and if all property and enterprise is to pass under state control, the destruction of the family unit becomes the prerequisite to the elimination of private enterprise. Whether one likes it or not, the current Women's Lib movement, the revolution of youth and the emasculation of the male are all part and parcel of the same conspiracy evil which is aimed at this end. Research into the humanistic ideology of Marxism as propounded by Engels and Marx, reveals that in pursuit of the elimination of private property, mothers and wives within the family unit become the first target. High priority is given to the so-called emancipation of women who are 'liberated' from the religion-marriage-property complex through their transformation into an 'industrial worker'. The need for such an emancipation arises out of the propaganda which 'explains' that private property and enterprise is the sole prerogative of the man who tolerates the woman as the means to produce children who become the father's heir to all his property. The women's role in the perpetuity of private property is thus presented as a subservient one in which 'domestic slavery' is covered by the pretentious terminology of 'wife'. This, of course, has become the Communist formula in the acquisition of private property - a formula which has filtered through to the West and is taking its toll in the womanhood of Anglo-Saxondom. Feminism or Women's Lib have become popular slogans in the west and current statistics reveal that broken homes and female aggression is on the increase. This is not liberty nor is it emancipation - it is a deliberate conspiracy which is aimed at the self-destruction of Anglo-Saxondom. The Marxist creed, as this centred on the emancipation of women as the means of state control of private property, emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century - at a time, when, through what may be termed as a 'legal revolution' in America, the status of women had been diminished. Prior to this however, women enjoyed a unique position in the community. As Lundberg and Farnham in "Modern Women, the Lost Sex," put it:... "the all too familiar view of women suddenly emerging in the nineteenth century from a long historical night on to a sunlit plain is completely wrong". In both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, women were often in business, were highly competent managers being involved in the shipping trade, as insurance brokers and in the manufacturing business. In Lundberg and Farnham's above quoted work, it is stated: "Up to the eighteenth century women usually figured in business as partners with their husbands, and not in inferior capacities. They often took charge during prolonged absences of their mates. In some instances, where they were the brighter of the pair, they ran the show". The 'legal revolution' previously referred to which was supported by men, arose out of the Law books initiated by Sir William Blackstone and England's Chief Justice, Edward Coke, which wrote down the role of the woman in marriage. In Walker's Introduction to American Law, it is stated: "The legal theory is, marriage makes the husband and wife one person, and that person is the husband. There is scarcely a legal act of any description that she is competent to perform". When one considers the status of women prior to this new legal code, it is amazing that reaction to it was not immediate and that it took almost a generation for the wheels of resentment to begin turning. During this period, the Church supported the view that women should be charming ornaments gracing the homes of the husband and producing his children - a support which was derived from a one sided and very distorted reading of scripture. Make no mistake here. Women are entitled to attempt the recovery of status lost - they would be

lacking in dignity if they did not - but the road to recovery is fraught with pitfalls of disaster. As has been noted previously, Marxism is geared to capitalise on all situations and that prevailing toward the end of the nineteenth century was tailor-made for Communist exploitation. It will have been noted in the materialistic ideology propounded by Engels that private property was a stumbling block to state control and that the male was considered as the last bastion in the complete take-over by the state. The propaganda therefore, was aimed against the husband and crystallised into an anti-male assault generated by a pro-female crusade for liberty. Without noting the deliberate anti-male conspiracy in the propaganda of contemporary Marxism, the various 'women's rights' movements aligned themselves, some wittingly and others unwittingly, with the principles expressed by Frederick Engels as essential for the total nationalisation of all private property. In one 'Women's Lib' publication, it is stated. "The myth of the contented women, happy in the subordinate role is perpetuated because men want it so and that because of this, society is deprived of women's full contribution as people". Thus, instead of restoring women to their rightful place of authority beside the man (of which more later), women's rights movements have been transformed into a militant 'feminism' - a terminology which implies aggressive competition with men.

The Effect of This in Anglo-Saxondom

The overall situation arising out of these so-called women's liberation movements has been and still is, disastrous. Apart from the total disruption of family life, identity on the individual plane is brought into jeopardy. The woman, because of her now aggressive role and self-assertion, is no longer recognisable as wife and mother. This identity is projected as totally submissive and reactionary to the new emancipation of women. The husband, formerly the dominant partner in the marriage, and because of the 'rights' issue inherent in all propaganda media, has been forced into a secondary or submissive role and is no longer recognised as 'head of the house' - another loss of identity. The children, reacting to the friction in the home have been transformed from integral parts of the family unit into self-willed islands of isolation doing their own thing. It should be noted again that this has not been a spontaneous development, but a carefully planned exercise which has been cleverly implemented. Basically, the women in Anglo-Saxondom are placid, homeloving and home-building persons with few interests outside those which affect her immediate family. This description however, no longer obtains. Through group pressure, the housewife is accused of being retrogressive in failing to discover her new identity as 'a person' - separate from that identity which formerly defined her as wife and mother. Those who resist this 'voyage of discovery' are further accused of lacking 'creativity' and devoid of courage to 'prove' herself equal to the male. Social pressures are almost inescapable for whenever group activity takes place, someone is sure to introduce the subject of chauvinism in which the wife is suppressed and deprived of the dignity of personal equality with the male. The tremendous psychological assault on the womanhood in Anglo-Saxondom has produced two major results - both of which are disastrous in the extreme. The first of these is the disruption of family life and the imbalance of relationships between husband, wife and children. While this situation could be corrected, the second is far more serious and is increasing in intensity as verified by medical statistic. Hitherto, the subject of mental attitudes in relationship to physical health has remained within the sphere of debate and discussion. However, clinical psychologists have now discovered that mental stresses, such as found in women participating in such movements as 'Women's Lib' are creating physiological problems. Hormonal irregularities have begun to manifest themselves with the bio-chemical function of the body acting in an unpredictable manner. Other symptoms becoming evident are spastic colon conditions, vaginal infections, bladder

infections, headaches and migraine and a host of other features formerly noted as the ordinary run of the mill problems. However, a positive pattern is beginning to emerge which suggests that the physiological effect of the mental stresses created by these new movements of political thought are having an adverse effect on the families in Anglo-Saxondom. The increase in pill-usage to alleviate the situation is yet another instance of this. It has been found that the husband, reacting to the aggression in the wife, has assumed a submissive role which is alien to him and which too has had adverse effects on him and his conduct. While the wife demonstrates an external aggression, the husband develops an internalised aggression which could possibly - this has not been established - account for the increase in the incidence of cardiac problems. Be that as it may, the continual sniping at one another by husband and wife have in turn an adverse effect on the children who are always interested spectators in any commotion. Because of this home disruption to which the children are now exposed, behavioural problems have developed and the children are now found to be non-compliant - they won't listen - they are aggressive in an acting out behaviour - they throw tantrums - they become highly manipulative, highly attention-seeking and in general, under-achieve in all that they attempt to do. As with the parents, the children fail to relate to one another and retreat into an isolationism seeking security within themselves and shunning environmental factors such as are exemplified by their home situations. In their adolescent years, the children retreat more and more into this isolationism and when they reach adulthood refuse to have meaningful relationship with others and certainly shy away from marriage as an evil to be avoided at all costs. The sperm count in males in this situation has been found to be very low and this, together with a reluctance to establish meaningful relationships with the opposite sex is seen in the declining birth-rate in Anglo-Saxondom. Identity, as a family is lost. The wife is no longer a wife but a competitor with the male for the position as head of the house. The husband retreats within a submissive role always defending himself and accounting for his actions in a vein similar to that of a child. Thus, in the female aggression, the husband is reduced to the status of a child and as a child, his petulant aggression creates the storm in the home which becomes devoid of structure or discipline. As is natural, the child refuses to identify with such an environment and becomes yet another factor in the general break-up of the family unit. That which has been written above is not fiction nor is it fantasy - it is reality - it is really happening throughout all Anglo-Saxondom and is having the effect of (a) reducing the birth-rate (UNO statistics confirm that while that of the coloured races is on the increase, that within the white race generally is on the decline); (b) destroying initiative within private enterprise which is the basic stimulant to the husband for the provision of his family; and (c) providing political reasons for the state control or the nationalisation of all private property. These three effects are basically national in context while at the same time are equally disastrous on the individual plane. There is no longer the time-honoured family institution of frank communication which, in the past, has made for meaningful relationships. With this deterioration of communication, the basic cure for the prevailing situation is held in abeyance for if husband, wife and child cannot relate to one another, how can they relate to God? Here again one is confronted by another facet of life affected by the feminist militarism for while the God of Biblical revelation is always spoken of in the masculine gender, the high-priestesses of the new cult of emancipation blaspheme His Name in their fanaticism. In a profane TV service several years ago conducted by Women's Libber's, the benediction - if one could call it by this name - was pronounced: "In the name of the mother, the daughter, and of the grand-daughter - A-women".

The Missing Factor - a God-Directed Home Structure

As has been noted, the family has been coerced into a society-centred institution which makes it vulnerable to shaping and conditioning according to the dictates of man. Scripturally, this is the very antithesis of the prescription for family life as provided by God. The society-orientated family today with all its heart-break and catastrophic implications to national continuity is, in company with so much else, yet another casualty in a world 'liberated' from God's Holy Law. As the survival of both family and nation depends on the re-implementation of God's Law - this is assured in Holy Writ - it would once again serve to note the pattern of family structure as this is recorded in the Bible. As one opens the pages of Holy Scripture, the first point which emerges in respect of commitment is that Almighty God provided a mandate to the Adamic family which involved a possessive function. It was told to subdue the earth and exercise dominion over it. From this, it is apparent that while the created earth was 'good' (Gen. 1:12) it was as yet undeveloped in terms of subjugation and possession by God's appointed governor - the Adamic race. This race therefore was committed to a responsibility which it was authorised to discharge solely within the limits of God's charge to them. Neither responsibility nor authorisation has been changed and the commitment remains valid to the present day. Whatever happened to the Adamic race when it was created 'male and female' in Genesis 1:26-27 is not told for the Bible closes that chapter in the middle of the fourth verse in Genesis 2. It is from this point that the Adam - in the Hebrew text the article pin-points a specific Adam as distinct from the generalisation of Genesis 1:26 - formed out of the dust of the earth, takes the limelight. Here the family, as a unit, takes over in which the balanced structure of the home, in terms of God's mandate, may be seen. "And the Lord God said; It is not good that man (Adam) should be alone; I will make an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18). While the phrase 'help meet' essentially implies 'to surround, protect, aid, help and succour', the fundamental pre-eminence of the male in the family is never challenged. The wife, in providing the above mentioned companionship, enjoys a community in authority in terms of the overall calling of her husband. Many, of course, charge that the Bible relegates the wife to a secondary or inferior position whereas the true role of the wife is a unique one in which neither inferiority nor superiority are tolerated. The authority of the woman as a help meet could, if one were to seek an adequate illustration for this, be seen in the authority of a colonel in the army. His authority grows as that of the general above him grows and likewise that of the wife is enhanced as the husband succeeds in his calling in life. Of course, much of the theological inferiority which is bestowed upon women today derives from the account in Genesis 3 in which, it is suggested, Eve exercised ascendancy over Adam leading him into sin. What is conveniently ignored is the fact the Eve's God-given duty was a counselling role and although in this case hers was ill-conceived counsel, it was nevertheless the exercise of her right in the family. The structure of the family and home, while being headed by the husband and father, nevertheless revolves around the mother of which figure, the scripture states: "Who can find a worthy woman for her value is above price, She has her husband's confidence, for all she does is to his advantage...Secure and aware of her influence, she feels her position is worth more than silver and thus does not falter in times of adversity. Using her influence she sustains all with whom she comes in contact, helping those depressed in mind or through circumstances and those who are destitute... She watches the company her family keeps allowing no slackness and her children accept this, knowing her to be honest, as does her husband who praises her..." (Prov.31:10-31). What a different picture to that obtaining in Anglo-Saxondom today - and yet a picture of the woman to come when her true liberty will be realised when the Law of the Lord becomes the national Constitution of the nation. This woman is indeed the model around which the family will revolve - a figure in which is centred the Fifth Commandment -

“Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee” (Ex.20:12).

Family Priorities

The centre of God’s Plan for world rehabilitation - if one is prepared to accept what the Lord has to say about this, as distinct from what theology pronounces as God’s Purpose - is His Holy Law operating within the nation for which it was codified and given at Sinai. This prodigious national Constitution revolves around the Code of Individual behaviour known as the Ten Commandments at the very heart of which the Lord Commands: “Honour thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee”. However, prior to a consideration of this Commandment which militates against state control and the erosion of the family structure, it is necessary to reconsider the matter of priorities as this concerns the family and its structure. The reason for this is that somewhere along the line, someone has reversed the order of things with the result that emphasis is now placed upon the importance of the individual whose whims and fancies take pre-eminence over the family. More, the individual claims - and is given - the ‘inalienable right to dispose of one’s own person as one pleases’ (definition of a lawsuit, Bonner vs. Moran, 1941) irrespective of the impact of this on the family unit. In other words, once an individual has reached the age of adult responsibility as prescribed by the law of the land, he or she can conduct themselves as they see fit with no moral obligations to prevent participation in the new social order of permissiveness. It has not always been like this. Once upon a time the family and not the individual was regarded as the basic social unit - a unit which comprised blood relatives descended from the same male ancestor as well as others attached to it by marriage or adoption. The traditional head of the family was generally the oldest son in the eldest line from the common ancestor and whose word was law and whose presence, because of his position, commanded respect and obedience. All this has gone as has the custom of displaying ‘family tress’ which today’s socially-orientated generation looks upon as mediaeval pride and reminiscent of a time when ‘rights’ as this is accepted today, did not exist. Notwithstanding the general attitude toward this subject, it is encouraging to note that among the younger generation i.e., those who have just married and started families of their own, there is a trend toward enquiry into their antecedents and not only this, but also into history of race migrations which resulted in the establishment of civilisation in the untamed wilderness of the world. As yet, the enquiry is on a limited scale but it does indicate that there are still those who resent the permissiveness which is shattering the family structure and which threaten the future unity between mother, father and children.

THE BIBLICAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FAMILY

The historical structure of the family unit in Anglo-Saxondom was Biblical in concept - an extension of the Abrahamic structure which was commended by the Lord in His Soliloquy recorded in Genesis 18. In this, a tremendous feature emerges in the fact that God's choice of Abraham as 'head' of the Covenant family was no arbitrary election. The choice was made - not because Abraham was a religious man - but because he 'obeyed my voice, kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws' (Gen.26:5). In pursuit of His objective to 'bless all the nations of the earth', the Lord reflected on the future of the Covenant family - a future which entailed the development of that family into a 'great and mighty nation' with each individual family within the nation being a law-orientated one. God said in Genesis 18:19: *"Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgement; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him"*.

Apart from the Lord's foreknowledge of Abraham's responsibility toward his position as head of the Covenant family, the person of parental instruction was established in that each parent was duty-bound to teach the young God's 'way of life' as the foundation round which the family revolved. In point of fact, much more emerges as one projects the Soliloquy of the Lord into His Law given at Sinai, for it throws a tremendous responsibility upon parents who need to realise that he or she represents God to their children. To a small and impressionable child, the family is his whole world with the father and mother becoming provider, protector, lover, teacher and law giver. Are these not the attributes of God Who claims to be a 'father' to Israel (Ex. 4:22; Jer. 31:9)? As 'father', the Lord **provides** for His Covenant family (Gen. 22:8-14); **protects** them (Gen. 5:1); **loves** them (Hos. 11:1); **teaches** them (Deut. 4: 10) and **gave them His Law** (Mal. 4:4). The parent, in the Israel Covenant family, represents God to the child, and in this role, is required to be obedient to God's way of life and to ensure that the environment which surrounds the child is conducive to this development into a God-fearing honourable person. This responsibility crystallised into a God-given one when it was written into the national Constitution and given to the nation at Sinai. Moses, in reiterating the Law to the new generation born in the wilderness said: *"And what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as this law, which I set before you this day? Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy sons, and thy son's son ..." (Deut. 4:8-9).*

Thus, in the education of the young, parents are enjoined to (a); emphasise the reality of God as this was demonstrated in the deliverance from Egypt and (b); teach the Law to the heir in the family - not stopping there but instructing his heir as well, thus ensuring continuity of knowledge.

Today's Pattern

In homes that have been shattered by the communistically orientated revolution of women, one finds the husband thrust into the submissive role and in this, by reason of having to explain his every motive or action, he behaves in a manner reminiscent of children. He is accused of placing his wife in a position of 'material dependence' upon him thereby causing

her to lose her liberty as an independent person. The neo-feminist today who considers material factors the most important in life has de-liberately ignored the lesson of history which has witnessed the outworking of the principles established in the Law of the Lord. Women's traditional compensation for material dependence is a variety of psychological and sentimental influences which have, from time to time, exerted profound spiritual domination over the male. Herman Keyserling in *Psychoanalyse de L'Amerique* draws attention to this incredible striving for material independence by the neo-feminists and states that the achievement of this independence and consequently material power is an empty goal, for these are only supreme when people believe it to be the decisive element. How far have the Anglo-Saxondom families come from the Law of the Lord which is perfect! Instead of adhering to the pattern for family happiness and prosperity as laid down by the Lord, both husband and wife have allowed themselves to be manipulated by psychological politics which is creating a society of introverts in which thought for self - no matter what the cost - dominates. Instead of teaching the children the 'fear of the Lord' which is surely the beginning of wisdom, one finds the mother, imbued with aggressive feminism, holding the view that beyond the sexual differences involved with procreation, there are no innate physiological or psychological differences separating male and female. It is contended that from the earliest infancy, boys and girls are conditioned by clothes, games and language to play the social role attributed to their sex and that consequently, in an equalitarian society, it would be sufficient to give trucks to little girls and dolls to boys in order to bring about an inversion of their social roles. Unfortunately, the neo-feminist has not left this theory to wander in the hypothetical realm, but have actually introduced it into their families. Professor Gilbert-Dreyfus, an endocrinologist, reacting to the spread of the sex-equalitarian experiment has warned: "Certain functions of the hypothalamus, an agglomeration of fibre's and nervous tissues which are an integral part of the brain, work differently according to sex. The thought processes of men and women are certainly not identical. I declare quite false the assertion that there is no masculine brain or feminine brain, but one unique and common brain, that of the human species... With dresses and dolls one risks making a boy into a neurotic child, but he nevertheless remains a boy. Uneasy in his own skin, badly adapted to the exterior world, he becomes a good candidate for transestitism and homosexuality". Is it purely coincidental that homosexuality in Anglo-Saxondom has increased in proportion to the increase of attempts to 'liberate' women under the ag-gressive feminism of Women's lib?

Youth

In considering the general attitude of youth today, it is more than a little evident that something has also gone awry - and that 'something' is the discipline to be found in the family structure. Obedience - which is the keynote associated with Biblical Law - no longer exists, indeed is castigated as an oppressive mechanism and destructive of the mind. The truly liberated person - so claims the humanistic propaganda of today - is the woman or youth (note the male is left out of this) who is the product of rebellion, who constantly challenges authority and agitates for reform within the educational system. It is quite common to hear the youth declaring that they 'didn't ask to be born' and because this status of living has been foisted on them, they have an inherent 'right' to dictate 'terms' under which they consent to participate in what they euphemistically call 'the human experience'. This is merely another indication in the non-maturity of youth. Is it not characteristic of the revolution of youth that they demand instant realisation of their ambitions? Is it not characteristic of the younger generation that when confronted by resistance - in the form of authority - they immediately embark on a campaign of destructive, revolutionary rage? This is precisely how a baby acts, for when hungry, the baby voids its bladder and bowels at will and cries in frustrated rage

when gratification is not instantaneous. Without enlarging on some of the debased behaviour actions of those participating in the youth rebellion against authority, it suffices to state that the actions of the baby are indulged in by those attending universities. According to John D. Rockefeller, the above stated situation should not be corrected, for at the age of 62, he said: "Instead of worrying how to suppress the youth revolution, we of the older generation should be worrying about how to sustain it". This, no matter how one approaches the subject, is gross immorality. The student involved in the revolution of youth assumes the 'right' to control and govern other people's properties. Advanced education at universities is not a 'right' but a privilege for the universities are the by-product of the tax-payer's money - in general, the parents of those who attend them. If the student has sufficient funds and is able to enlist the support of like-minded students to build their own educational institution, then, and only then, have they the 'right' to govern and control, but under the prevailing situation, he attends university on the terms of those whose property rights govern the school. This is not coercion as a student - it is the exercise of the rights which belong to those who have earned them. It is of course, a basic premise - supported by the facts of today - that authority is basic to the nature of any and every society and that if this is shattered, the society collapses or continues to be held together in error with chaotic consequences. 'Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee' - here is the Bible authority for a stable society in the land and one which strikes at the very heart of the problem confronting Anglo-Saxondom today. If one considers the account of this Commandment recorded in Deuteronomy 5:16, it will be seen that the authority for demanding 'honour' to parents comes from God Himself for the words 'as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee' are added. Today of course, children in general do not honour their parents and while one may deplore this, are they really to blame - is there not joint responsibility in this?

The Fifth Commandment

The Fifth Commandment is not, as many have assumed, directed at minor children alone, for the Hebrew word 'honour' differentiates between the children who have not yet come to age and those who are adult and themselves parents. Children per se are expected to 'obey' - (Heb: shama) - their parents (Deut. 21:18), whereas the Fifth Commandment demands 'honour' which as the Hebrew word implies, is adult behaviour. The Hebrew word Kabad which has been translated as honour is a primitive Hebrew root which has a wide variety of meanings which in the main centre on 'to glorify'; to 'promote to honour'; to 'make glorious'; to 'give great consideration to' and to 'respect'. While it is not denied that obedience will achieve the same end, the specific usage of the Hebrew Kabad appears to have as its main target young parents just setting out on the course of family life. It is a reminder to recall their childhood and the manner in which they were instructed in God's Law and perhaps to recall how punishment was meted out for transgression of that Law. They would, for instance, know all the requirements of the Law, for their parents had ensured that the instruction in Deuteronomy 4:7-10 and 6:6-7 had been adhered to. Then too there was the national reading of the Law every sabbatical year (Deut.31:10-13) at which all, the old and young alike, were compelled to attend. If they were over the age of twenty-one years, they would have attended three such national readings of the Law and during that period, no doubt had witnessed the punitive (punishment) clauses in the Law being put into practice. It would of course be foolishness to suppose that every parent applied the Law to the child when it failed to obey, for in Proverbs one finds warnings against parental tender-heartedness toward them. Then as now, excuses were made for bad behaviour. However, in Proverbs 13:24, it is stated: *"He that spareth his rod hateth his son"* while in 19:18 it is declared: *"Chasten thy*

son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying". Chastening could be a lifesaver to the child for in Proverbs 23:13-14 it is stated: "Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell".

Make no mistake here. There was juvenile delinquency in Israel in Biblical times, but this delinquency was dealt with in a manner totally unacceptable to the world today. In today's society, pity has become a word which is synonymous with the word 'Christian' and this is carried to lengths which make the Word of God of none effect. As has been referred to elsewhere, the murderer today has all the pity of the community which does not give a second thought for the dependants of the murdered person. Previous mention has, of course, been made of the reversal of priorities and this is yet another of these. Biblical Law demands pity for the offended and certainly not for the offender. It is seldom that one reads a commentary on the Law concerning juvenile delinquency, and yet this Law was read every seven years in Israel and accepted in its totality by the people. The young parents too accepted this, for their parents had accepted it and had implemented the punitive clauses when these were warranted. This is where 'honour thy father and thy mother' comes into the picture. The Law concerning juvenile delinquency is stated in Deut. 21:18-21 as; *"If a man have a stubborn (Heb: carar; backsliding, revolter) and rebellious (Heb: marar: disobedient, provocative) son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them: Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton (Heb: zalal, to be loose morally) and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he shall die: so shall thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear."*

The natural modern reaction to this would be one of shocked disapproval for what parent would voluntarily deliver their son to execution? It should be recalled that the family was required to align itself wholeheartedly with God's Law rather than with a criminal member. It was the community which became the complainant and the community which became the executioner, for juvenile delinquency was a crime against both family and community. If the parents refused to complain against the delinquent, they were guilty of breaking the Fifth Commandment for they then repudiated the very Law which their parents had held as valid and to which they had been subjected. They then became a party to the offence and as such, a defender of crime in general. Does it 'promote to honour' the grandparents when one's own children violate with impunity the principles which they handed down as an inheritance? Is it 'respect' to the grand-parents to allow the disintegration of the family to which they gave birth through whoredom in the daughters and homosexuality in the sons? Is it giving 'weighty consideration to' parents when one allows the priceless heritage of God's Service to be overshadowed by one's own personal likes and dislikes? Today, the individual family in Anglo-Saxondom has very little left of its inheritance for its security in land inheritance has been greatly diminished through an increased state control in this. Its efficacy as a witness to God too has diminished until it is fast reaching the point where God has no place in it at all. The family is an arena of conflict with father, mother and children doing their own thing - a 'thing' which is family suicide and national destruction. It is no exaggeration to claim that today in Anglo-Saxondom, identity has all but vanished. The family is fast reaching the stage of being a non-family unit while this is reflected in the nation which has lost its way both spiritually and materially. However, the Word of God assures that the time of recovery is

near at hand when father, mother and children will indeed be emancipated from the diabolical conspiracy which seeks not the liberation of man, but the enslavement of all creation.

THE DEADLY FREEDOM

“Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then ye shall know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things . . . If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (John 8: 28 - 32).

God’s Holy Law, or the Law of the Lord, is more than a lesson in religious discipline - it is a practical political instrument designed for operation within the specific sphere of God’s national Covenant People, Israel. It is not a universal mechanism nor was it provided as the Constitutional basis for all nations. A sophisticated and sceptical generation will no doubt scoff at such a suggestion, but *“If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead”* (Luke 16:31), and, no matter what one may say, scriptural Truth, when in opposition to intellectual fiction, invariably suffers rejection. What did Moses and the prophets say? In the first instance, Moses, in presenting the Law to the children of Israel said: *“The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law”* (Deut. 29:29).

There is absolutely no suggestion whatsoever of the universality of those ‘revealed things’ or the law. Moses went even further. He stated that the imperative need within the Israel people was that they ‘do’ and ‘keep’ the statutes and judgments of the Law for *“ . . this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people”* (Deut. 4:6).

A literal translation derived from Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon renders these passage as *“do these statutes and judgments for they are your skill and your meaning projected to the nations for a witness that God is in your midst”*. It is a matter of Biblical history that the then nations of the middle east were deprived of this witness, for the Israel people, instead of applying themselves to their own God-given Constitution, were influenced by the surrounding nations and demanded a system of government similar to their’s.(1 Sam. 8:5). The prophets pick up the story from this point and each and every one has the same indictment against Israel in that they charge that the nation had departed from God’s Law. Isaiah likened the situation in Israel to Sodom and Gomorrah and called for a return to the Law of the Lord (Isa. 1:10); Jeremiah charged that the people had forgotten their God and teachers of the Law did not know Him (Jer. 2:8); Hosea related the structure of society in Israel as being one in which there was no truth, mercy or knowledge of God in the land the cause of which was the neglect of God’s Law (Hos. 4:1-6); Daniel, in captivity and praying for the nation said: *“To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him. Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him”* (Dan. 9:9-11).

When Hosea charged that God’s people were destroyed through lack of knowledge (Hos. 4:6), while he was undoubtedly writing of the then obtaining situation, his words have a

familiar ring today, for the same principle is in force. God's People do not know what is required of them, and their leaders, both ecclesiastical and secular, have ignored two vital vents in history which set the scene for the modern antinomianism or the permissive society. The ecclesiastical leaders of today must carry the main burden for this, for in propagating liberty without God's Law they are engendering a deadly freedom which is a self-destructive mechanism for both nation and individual.

The First Event - Christianity Versus Pharisaism

In considering the two historical events which laid the foundation for the modern scene, one should be absolutely clear in one's own mind as to the position of the Law at the time of the first Advent. When the Lord Jesus Christ said: ***"If ye continue in my word, then ye are my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"***, He was not advocating the deadly freedom of lawlessness. The context against which He spoke these words was, of course, ***"the things which my Father hath taught me"*** and as it was the Father who energised the prophets (2nd Peter 1:21) to write His indictment against Israel's lawlessness, it would surely be more than a little confusing if the Son changed the charge and commended that ***'each man do that which is right in his own eyes'***.

Make no mistake here. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate in the flesh (John 1:14), did not lower the standards of the Law of the Lord to conform with the so-called human conscience, nor did He advocate the transposition of any of its clauses to accommodate the emotional considerations of men. At that time, Talmudic law was in operation - a facet of law-keeping which centred on rabbinical interpretations and which had as its main feature, the adaptation of the Law to a conformity with what the Jews required of it. This, in itself, is a most illuminating feature for while the Jews professed to keep the Law of Moses, the rabbinical censorships and amendments rendered the whole body of the Law as of none effect (Matt. 15:3,6). The Lord Jesus Christ stipulated that: ***"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail"*** (Luke 16:17). Thus, as one looks at the Ministry of the Lord, one may see that in all things He upheld the statutes and the judgments of the Law as given to Israel at Sinai and did not condone the breaking of the least of the commandments (Matt. 5:19). It is necessary at this stage to recapitulate that the Law, i.e. the commandments, the statutes and the judgments, were part and parcel of a political instrument designed to operate within God's Israel people in their capacity as God's Witnesses (Isa. 43:12). The ordinances of propitiatory sacrifices were the religious disciplines which involved the Aaronic priesthood as mediators of reconciliation in the event of both national and individual transgression of the LAW. The religious ordinances i.e. the shedding of sacrificial blood in propitiation for sin, came to an end (Heb. 9:25-28) when the Lord offered Himself as the one, full, sufficient and final Sacrifice for those who had transgressed the Law. After this, no further sacrifice was necessary and in consequence, the ritualistic aspect of the Law passed, leaving the statutes and judgments to govern the national witness of God's People. As the Bible makes abundantly clear, the Jews resented the allegation that they were not keeping the Law of Moses - if was in fact not given to them for the word 'Jew' is significantly missing until many centuries after the giving of the Law at Sinai - and their animosity to the Lord is recorded for all to read. This antagonism did not end with the Death of the Lord for despite the evidence of His Resurrection, they did everything to discredit both Him and His ministry which naturally brought Pharisaism into conflict with Christianity. The gulf widened as Christian theology began to add its interpretations to the Message of the Lord Jesus Christ with particular emphasis of the non-continuity of the Law which militated against the inclusion of all and sundry. This theology had developed to such proportions that in His

message to the Church at Sardis at the close of the first century in the Christian dispensation, the Lord Jesus Christ drew attention to its implication. He said to that Church: ***“I know thy works, that thou hast a name and thou livest, and art dead . . .”*** (Rev. 3:1). To quote a modern translation: ***“I know what you have done, that you have a reputation for being alive, but in fact you are dead”*** (J.B. Phillips translation). If one were to ascertain the yardstick which differentiated between being alive and dead, one need not go further than the Law for Moses, to whom the Lord made continual reference, said: *“See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; In that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments . . .”* (Deut. 30:15).

‘Life and good - death and evil’ - obedience is life; disobedience is death. With a theology based on the non-continuity of the Law and a doctrine of universalism, it is small wonder that the Lord declared the condition of the Church at Sardis as being dead. While it became the practice of the Church in Palestine and its environs to ridicule the Law, discounting it as a stumbling block to the spread of Christianity among all people, Christianity as established in the British Isles retained the Law which was an integral part of the teaching of the Apostles, who according to the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius (A.D. 254-340 “ . . . passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles”. If this history is true, and there is no reason to doubt it, the doctrines as taught by the theology in Palestine, and that by the Apostles who reached Britain, had the essential difference that one taught the Law of the Lord while the other repudiated it. Historical proof of this will be seen in the comment on the second vital event which most teachers today ignore. Thus, the first of the overlooked instances of moment in history is that men have failed to note that the Jews observed rabbinical traditions concerning the Law and not the Law itself. The Palestinian theology which developed after the Ascension of the Lord was stimulated by its antagonism to Pharisaism which, it was contended, was synonymous with the denial that Jesus was the son of God. Further, mistakenly believing that the Jews practised the ‘law of Moses’ and despite what the Lord had to say about this, they equated God’s Law with Pharisaism and as they rejected the Jew’s religion, so they rejected the Law.

The Second Historical Event

As the Christian theology spread towards Rome, it developed an entirely new concept of God’s Word in that, to complete its break with the nationalism of the Old Testament which it equated with the Jews, it endowed the narrative with the character of typology i.e. nothing had political substance, but all which was recorded was written to demonstrate some spiritual truth. Some of the early Church ‘fathers’ contended that the Jews were totally incorrect in believing that the ‘dietary laws’ concerned ‘actual food’ - that these laws, in fact, contained ‘spiritual food’ alone! As is common knowledge, Rome was ‘converted’ to the Christian faith at the beginning of the fourth century when Constantine, himself a convert, issued a decree of tolerance for the Christian faith. With the downfall of Imperial Rome - some say that it was because of the principles involved in Christian theology - one finds the emergence of the Papacy, the theology of which merely extended that of the Palestinian Church and added this to the ‘mysteries of Babylon’, thus fusing Babylonian paganism with Christian theology. The missionary enterprises of the Palestinian Christian church to proselytise all and sundry was followed and in 596, Augustine was sent to Britain by Pope Gregory to ‘enlighten’ the already established church concerning the correct theology. It is a matter of history that Augustine succeeded and the faith transplanted by the Apostles from Palestine to Britain gave way to the theology of Rome. It has been stated earlier that the

Apostolic faith engendered by the actual teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ with its emphasis on the Law was taken to Britain by the Apostles themselves. While many theologians may contest this statement, let their argument be with the historians, Sabellius, Origen, Eusebius and Gildas plus the findings of the Church Councils of Pisa (1417), Constance (1419), Sens (1423), and Basle (1431), all of which ruled that the British Church took precedence over all others being founded by Joseph of Arimathea immediately after the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Venerable Bede, whose 'Ecclesiastical History' was an eyewitness account of developments in Britain subsequent to Augustine's appearance in that country, provides supporting evidence that the Scots, at least, were still observing things Hebraic and were not following the theology of Rome. Bede recorded that the Scots were celebrating the Old Testament Passover festival - a projection of the Law from Palestine to Britain - a feature strongly resented by Rome. Bede wrote: "The same Pope Honorius also wrote to the Scots whom he had found to err in the observance of Easter, exhorting them not to think of their small number, placed in the utmost borders of the earth, wiser than all the ancient and modern Churches of Christ throughout the world; and not to celebrate a different Easter, contrary to the Papal calculation, and the synodical decrees of all the Bishops upon earth". A papal decree was thus issued which broke the last remaining ties of the old British church with the Law of the Lord. As the Church of Rome became the dominant force within Christianity, its doctrines and decrees were never challenged until the years of the Reformation and even then, the law had been so successfully repealed by men that even the Reformers continued the theology of antinomianism. Thus, despite an open Bible, Christianity still followed the teaching of men rather than the requirements of God. The Papal decree in 634 A.D. abolishing the last traces of Law-observance in Scotland, and the ever-widening gulf between Christianity and Pharisaism whose supposed observance of the Law of Moses was incompatible with the new ethic, were the two events which have been forgotten today. If the 'fathers' of the Reformation had been bold enough to discard what they had been taught by men and to embrace what God requires of His people - what a different tale would have been recorded in Anglo-Saxon history. Government would not be in the sterile position of subservience to the dictates of political considerations. The economies of both national and individual life would not be dictated by the money-lenders and land tenure would not be the precarious possession that it is today. The health of the nation, or rather the ill-health of the nation, would not be the incredible national drain that it is and the family would not be the center of national disruption.

Is This Reality or Philosophy?

There are of course, those who would naturally say that this is all speculation - a philosophy built on wishful thinking arising out of the need of the times. Is it? How many people have ever tried to see the Law of the Lord in a modern context? How many have ever thought of it as applicable to the present need? The propaganda of today is of course, that man must find his own political salvation within the realms of his own conscience, for God, so they say, is not interested in these matters but merely waits for the souls of those who die 'in Him'. If this is so, there are a lot of strange things happening in the world which appear to suggest otherwise. How real were the warnings against transgressions of God's Law? How seriously did God's Israel people take them in Biblical days? One would venture to say that the scepticism which obtains today within Anglo-Saxondom in respect of God's Law is a reflection of that which obtained when their forebears lived in the land of Canaan. They did not take the Law seriously and were no doubt conned into believing that it was merely a religious exercise designed to keep them in line. It was infinitely more than that, as Bible history makes abundantly clear. God warned of certain and inevitable consequences which

would follow Law violation (Lev. 26:14-33) and each of these became the experience of the people as they ignored the warning signs as they intensified. They were taken into captivity - as God said they would be - and they embarked upon a 2,520 year course of corrective punishment - as He said they would. After '2 days', the people rose up again during the Reformation - as He said they would (Hos. 6:2) - but because of national blindness, they are once again being diminished - just as He said would happen (Isa. 59:10-18). Israel - Biblical Israel that is - has become a very real thing in Anglo-Saxondom, for what this company of nations is today, is what God said His Israel people would be through a continued violation of His Law. It is no longer a philosophy when the cold and unbiased facts of the contemporary scene reveal a pattern of disasters which, according to the Word of God delivered to Israel almost four thousand years ago, was prescribed for Law transgression. Consider for a moment the account in Deuteronomy 28 where no less than thirty disasters, calamities or distresses are listed as a consequence for Law transgression - all of which are applicable today in Anglo-Saxondom. Take, for instance, the literal translation of verse 20 which reads: ***"The Lord will send upon you judgment, confusion and frustration in all that you undertake to do . . ."*** and is this not the situation as it obtains within the national policies of the Anglo-Saxon company of nations? If one were to take each one of the clauses as set out in this chapter it will be seen that there is not one land in all Anglo-Saxondom which has not, at some time or other in very recent times, experienced every one of these clauses. Ill health is there; economics is there; land tenure is there; agriculture is there; malfunction of government is there and above all, the disruption of family life is there.

"The stranger (sojourner: Young's Literal Translation) that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low" (verse 43) - is this not the situation as it currently destroys the nation - ***"Thou shalt betroth a wife, and another man shall lie with her"*** (verse 30) - is this not typical of what is transpiring today? How much more evidence does the world require and how much more proof does Anglo-Saxondom need to stimulate a return to God's Holy Law? How much more must God's People pay for this 'deadly freedom' from God's Law?

What of the Other People?

God's Law, as it regulates the relationships between His people and the other races of the world, invariably invokes the comment that it is not 'Christian'. It may not be 'Christian' as men conceive Christianity, but bearing in mind the historical departure from the Words of the Lord Jesus Christ and the unauthorised repealing of God's Law by early theology, can one use this term and still remain within scriptural limits? The answer is a categorical no. Against this, many will ask just where do the races of the world fit in and one can only say that God has His Own place for them. In Micah 4, one reads of the revelation of the Lord's foreknowledge in that mention is made of the time when the Kingdom of God is set up.

"And many nations (note it does not say ALL) shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

It should be noted here that those nations who shall enquire of the Lord will be taught by Him and not by Israel for Israel's mandate was not extended to teaching the nations of the earth the Law. Israel's Law was for Israel and this had, as its objective, two fundamental features. The first was to establish a God-centred Nation, healthy, wealthy and prosperous in all its

undertakings, and the second, to project to the nations of the world that the fact that the Lord Alone is responsible. He has the well-being of all creation at heart despite the satanic degeneration which resulted from Luciferian interference. Thus the Law, and its attendant blessing within a perfect social structure, is to be the magnet with which nations seek God to know His way for them. This is certainly the very antithesis of universalism as taught today when teachers would make all conform to one doctrine and to one concept. Note again that these many nations go up to the 'house of the God of Jacob' - they recognise that He is the one True God and consequently enquire of Him that He teach them to have a way of life equal to that of Israel. This is that of which Moses spoke (Deut. (4:5-6) when he said concerning the statutes and judgments: *"Keep therefore and do them for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations . . ."* The end result of all this? *" . . . they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. But they shall sit every men under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it"*.

Here is peace - here is security - and this results from the Law going forth from Zion, Israel's political center when it legislates to abolish all other legislation and to embrace the Law of the Lord. The end result of this is again described by Micah in which he wrote: *"For all people will walk in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever"*.

This is nothing to do with a multiplicity of Gods, but rather one God, known and served under different Names as He reveals Himself and teaches His way for the nations of the earth. This time is still a long way off and God's People have much to endure before it eventuates, but though the horizon may seem to be black with disaster and the national path fraught with pitfalls, one should ever remember that He who keeps Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps and that He is mindful for His people whom He formed for Himself to accomplish that which He pleases in the earth (Isa. 43:21). God's word shall indeed not return unto Him void and because of this assurance, let all the house of Israel know that they have a future and a destiny far removed from the chaos and disorganised society as it ravages God's People today. Meanwhile

DISOBEDIENCE SICKENS A NATION

“If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law . . . Then thy Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and a sore sicknesses, and of long continuance. Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee: (Deut. 28:58-60).

Blindness to national identity is a curse in more ways than one. At a time when political opinion militates against the expression of nationalism within the Anglo-Saxon company of nations and demands world-wide acceptance of the national sovereignty for all others - resistance to the identification of Anglo-Saxondom with Israel of the Old Testament invariably centers on what may be termed the economics of the matter. One finds the average Christian resisting on the grounds that they believe that the Old Testament, with its narrow nationalisms (to quote one theological professor) has been done away with, thus invalidating any need for national identification in the Christian dispensation. In other words, universalism or the brotherhood of man now takes precedence over all else - even what God declared on Oath in terms of His Covenant Purpose in the earth (Gen. 22:16-18).

Further, while many conservatively minded people acknowledge that all of the nations of the earth, the Anglo-Saxon people are the main target of a conspiratorial attack, they appear reluctant to accept a Bible-based explanation for this. The usual response, in one form or another, is: ‘If we, the White Anglo-Saxon people are Israel, what good is it?’ By way of answer and in terms of priorities, such an identification meets a great, almost desperate need today in that it frees God from the theology of man. This theology projects God as a religious Deity much in the same vein as did the priests of ancient times - a Deity Who is amenable to and reconcilable with all that man today does under the pretended discipline of the human conscience.

Acceptance of Anglo-Saxon identity with Israel of the Bible - based on the historical development of these people plus the contemporary scene in relationship with the Covenant Promises plus the ‘sure word of prophecy’ - transposes man’s concept of God from nebulous religious philosophy into practical reality and political certainty. This, of course, immediately creates a stir among religionists who refuse to equate the God of the Bible with politics in any form and pronounce their judgment upon such an equation as heresy. Fair enough!

This article - indeed the whole series of **‘No Liberty Without Law’** - is not written to appease those who follow what men have said, those who refuse to leave the cloisters of modern theology, it is written against the background of the need of Anglo-Saxondom to re-discover its God and His Directives for His People, and for those people who believe in the God of Bible revelation and who believe He is concerned - seven days a week, for all His creation. Thus, in terms of first things first, the identification of the Anglo-Saxon peoples with Israel, the Covenant People of God’s world-wide purpose, re-establishes that God is central to the nations existence and projects His Omnipotence into the every-day politics of life by historically proving that He said what He meant and meant what He said.

Further, it reveals a God of Love and Life at work in a tangible and politically discernible manner. In a secondary sense, the 'good' derived from the acceptance of Israel's identity with Anglo-Saxondom today hits right at the heart of a problem which is causing increasing concern. Everyone within Anglo-Saxondom is affected by the ill-health of the nation plus the escalating health costs which today (*written 20 years ago*), stand at 9.4 per cent of the gross national product. Individual and national health is surely a 'good' worthy of consideration! In the United States, the February 'Social Security Bulletin' reported that average health expenditures had increased on an average of 12 per cent per year between 1965 and 1973 and by 14 per cent in the next two years to be followed by 16.35 per cent in 1977. In Britain, the National Health Service is finding it increasingly difficult to meet the requirements of the people - not only because of the skyrocketing costs of hospitalization, but also because of the many new factors introduced into national health because of immigration from areas where disease still dominates the scene. The American Hospital Association has announced tighter controls in hospitals and has reduced the average length of a patients stay by a minimum of one day. Finance is indeed becoming a major consideration and while it is not suggested that a patient would be discharged not fully recovered, the possibility does exist that this could happen because of finance. Statistics indicate that in 1963 and in Community Hospitals, the cost per patient per day was \$35 whereas in 1976, the cost had risen to slightly above \$150 per day. It has been calculated that by reducing the patients stay in hospitable by one day - at \$150 per day - the 35 million hospitalized patients in 1976 saved approximately five billion dollars. If the saving is astronomical, what incredible figure is being paid annually throughout all Anglo-Saxon lands for the ill health of the nation? Frantic government action to curb State spending on health services is reaching panic levels for in conjunction with inflation and the hundred and one other ills, governments in Anglo-Saxon countries are finding themselves in a vice which is tightening every year. The cost in research attendant on the diseases so prevalent in these countries is escalating almost monthly with that into cancer now in excess of the eight hundred million dollar a year bracket. Statistics provided by the American Cancer Society and quoted in the CBS News Almanac for 1978, indicates that in 1977, 543,000 new cases of cancer of all types were reported. Other problems too are adding their contribution to the causes for concern. IN 1976, the World Health Organisation (WHO) had confidently proclaimed that smallpox had been eradicated and that the attention of authorities could now be directed in other directions. However, smallpox has not been terminated. New outbreaks have been reported - admittedly in north-east Africa, but by reason of travel facilities now available, this could and has spread into the West. Thus despite the WHO pronouncement concerning this disease, the resources of Anglo-Saxon countries are once again thrown into the battle to combat not only smallpox, but also other diseases such as Laasa fever and Marburg disease. Disease and ill-health are taking their toll in both people and resources with politicians now faced with the unenviable task of coping with a mounting expenditure in health services. It need not be so. At just such a time as this, the 'watchmen' in Israel should be **'Crying aloud and shewing God's people where they have sinned' (Isa. 58:1)**. The Lord God of Israel has decreed: ". . . if ye harken to these judgments, and keep and do them . . . the Lord will take away from thee all sickness, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee . . ." (Deut. 7:12-15).

(If the above figures applied some 20 years ago, then our present position must be beyond belief).

The "Diseases of Egypt"

To the supercilious, any suggestion that God's Holy Laws should be invoked as the remedy for today's ills is untenable, for to them, anaesthetized by the social gospel of anti-nomianism (lawlessness), God's Law was abolished at Calvary from which point in time - so they contend - human conscience became the only discipline for human behavior. If this is so, why, in the name of sanity are the Anglo-Saxon people suffering the 'diseases of Egypt' and why are they on the receiving end of the judgments which God has proscribed for His people alone if they failed to obey His Law? Is it not time that this modern generation on true Israelites (Anglo-Saxons) began to utilise its undoubted intellect and to realise what God is providing by way of an incentive against the total erosion of nationhood today? He has used the hot, dry climate of Egypt to preserve papyri which bears its testimony to the authenticity of His Word and to provide an insight - for those who are truly searching for truth - into the vocabulary used at the time of the First Advent. He has also used that same land - Egypt - and has stirred up the curiosity of men of science so that His people today may know something of the diseases of Egypt which He had warned would be the recurring sickness for Law transgression.

One should be in no error here. Though the work of such men as Dr. Armand Ruffer, W.A. Smith, A.B. Shaw, J.K. Mitchell, F.A. Boyle, A.T. Sandison and a host of others, today's generation of Israelites is in a position to know precisely why they are such a sick company of nations and what the Lord meant by His phrase 'the Diseases of Egypt'. These men, through exhaustive examinations of the mummies of ancient Egypt, have provided a graphic illustration of life as it was lived in those far-off days, plus the amazing picture of the ancient disease which took their toll of the population. For instance, there is photographic evidence of a femur of a high-born Egyptian who lived during the period referred to as the time of the Old Kingdom. The picture clearly indicates malformations such as can result from chronic rheumatism. Similar misshapen bones have been found on thousands upon thousands of mummy skeletons suggesting that chronic rheumatism afflicted an extraordinary large number of persons through the course of Egyptian history. Is it purely coincidental that this disease of ancient Egypt is becoming increasingly prevalent in the Anglo-Saxon people today? Is this merely one of the environmental factors with which God's people have to deal in the pursuit of their occupations - or is a call from the Lord to remember the cost of disobedience to His Law? Rheumatic disease - a collective term which connotes pain and disability of the musculoskeletal system - was estimated to be one of the leading causes of crippling the United States in 1976. Over 22 million Americans, or at least 10 per cent of the population were affected by this in one form or another. So serious is this disease that the National Arthritis Act of 1974 was initiated, the implementation and financing of which cost the Federal Government an estimated 39.2 million dollars in 1975. Would it not be a 'good' of inestimable value if rheumatic disease could be a thing of the past? It could be - if the people accepted their identity and the Constitution which the Lord God provided for them. In 1903, Elliot Smith, whose investigations of the mummies of Egypt had provided so much incentive for further medical examination of the dead of Egypt past, intimated that his research on the upper and lower jaws of men who lived when the pyramids of Giza were built, indicated symptoms of parodontosis which men today consider the by-product of modern times. After examining some five hundred skulls from the graves of Giza and noting the social progress toward an affluent society, Smith concluded that the middle and upper classes in Egypt suffered from dental caries as much as modern man and that this resulted from the increasing refinement of food. While one would hesitate to equate dental caries with the disease of Egypt, the presence of this condition, together with the fact of refined food found in the burial jars accompanying the dead bodies certainly coincides fairly well with modern notions of the relationship between caries and food today.

Comment has already been made of the fact of the increase in the incidence of smallpox and although this is predominantly in Africa, cases have been reported in both Britain and the United States. In an existing photograph of King Rameses 5th (circa 1200 - 1085 B.C.), one may see that which Armand Ruffer recognised as the typical lesions of smallpox - a disease which ravaged Europe until the discovery of vaccination which, while it certainly contained the disease, has not by any means eradicated it. It is, of course, a fact that vaccination of children against this disease is mandatory in most Anglo-Saxon countries and while this has served to cut down the known incidence of the disease, the vast moving populations from other lands today is helping to revive the horror of this disease of ancient Egypt. Another of the disease of Egypt discovered by Armand Ruffer was announced in 1910 when he made known the results of microscopic analysis of the preserved kidneys of two mummies of the 20th Dynasty. In these he found the calcified eggs of an intestinal worm that was the terror of the inhabitants of the Nile Valley and which affected two out of every five persons. What Ruffer discovered was the bilharzia worm. While bilharzia is a disease found predominantly in Africa, South America and the East, the migration of people from these countries into the Western Anglo-Saxon lands has meant they have brought this disease with them and any full medical check-up performed today invariably takes in the possibility of bilharzia being present. As this was undoubtedly one of the disease of Egypt and as the Lord warned that modern Israel would be afflicted with these, it would serve to set out the life cycle of this worm. Bilharzia, a fluke, *Schistosoma haematobium*, is picked up by a person either bathing, drinking or simply wading in infected water. The parasites enter the bloodstream - it is thought through the skin - and travel to the portal vein which carries the blood from the intestines to the liver where they stay for approximately six weeks and become mature adults. The male and female copulate in the portal vein - the female then moving off to lay her eggs in the mucous membrane of the bladder, rectum or lower colon. The eggs leave the body in the urine or faeces and if one drops into water - it may be a placid pond, a slow moving river or lake - the egg changes into a miracidium, in which form it can swim. The miracidia search out a water snail which becomes the host for its next development - the cercaria. The cercariae live in the water until the next unwary person comes along and the cycle starts all over again. The effect of this disease on a person is indeed most serious. The eggs in the bladder or rectum cause irritation and bleeding while chronic inflammation in the bladder could lead to stones and possibly cancer. While men are still seeking an adequate treatment for this disease, according to 'Pear's Medical Encyclopaedia', the drugs used 'produce side effects ranging from abdominal pain and nausea to heart failure or temporary madness'. Bilharzia is one of the diseases of Egypt and it is taking its toll in Anglo-Saxon lands today simply because people will not heed the Law of the Lord which controls the presence of the alien in their midst and also the resistance to disease in the dietary laws. Another of the disease of ancient Egypt - and this despite the dry air of the country - was tuberculosis - a conclusion arrived at by Ruffer and Elliot Smith after the exhaustive examinations of the mummy of a priest of Amon which showed unmistakable signs of the typical curvature of Pott's disease which is an accumulation of tubercular pus beneath the lumbar muscle. Couples with their families, all victims of spinal tuberculosis, were found buried side by side in the common grave attesting to the toll taken by this disease. There is very little need for comment on this for its existence in Anglo-Saxondom today is yet another evidence of the people's departure from God's Law. Other diseases in Egypt - all substantiated by an in-depth examination of the mummified organs - the liver, stomach and intestines - of Egypt's ancient dead reveal that chronic gall-bladder infections took their toll as did appendicitis and cirrhosis of the liver - a condition frequently caused by chronic alcoholism. Ruffer found bacteria which indicated the presence of bubonic plague while the Ebers Papyrus (of which more presently) indicates that amoebic dysentery, typhoid fever and cholera were constant

menaces to the people. Atrophied kidneys, that fatal consequence of chronic renal inflammation and abscesses were frequently found in canopic jars thus indicating yet another modern illness as obtaining in ancient Egypt. Venereal diseases too were rife in Egypt - an attestation to the loose morality of the people engendered by the affluence of society at that time. Today's situation is almost the same with identical immorality attending this. According to the American Social Health Association, over eight million persons in the United States experienced some form of venereal disease in 1977. During this year, a new form of gonorrhea made its appearance which was resistant to penicillin and while combinations of antibiotics have been used against this, results have been far from satisfactory. Poliomyelitis, a paralysing disease of the nervous system caused by a virus infection of the anterior horn cells of the spinal cord and the nuclei of the motor cranial nerves, while being under control at the moment is by no means totally eradicated. In existing photographs of a memorial stele which show a doorkeeper making offerings to the goddess, one may see the shortened leg which, after extensive research by J.K. Mitchell and W.R. Dawson and other specialists, was pronounced as indicating poliomyelitis. While there was some resistance to the diagnosis in this particular case, the prevalence of this disease a few years ago would certainly support both Mitchell and Dawson's conclusion. Yet another of the diseases of Egypt has taken its toll in modern Israel. With regard to the modern scourge of cancer - research into which cost an estimated eight hundred million dollars in 1977 - nothing of a positive nature has been produced concerning this in ancient Egypt. It is perfectly true that A.B. Granville had, in 1825 diagnosed an ovarian tumour found in a mummy as malignant, but this appeared to be an isolated case. Smith and Dawson found a number of tumours of the bone in the skeletons of three mummies said to belong to people living between 2563 and 2433 B.C. in which one tumour had affected the femur and two the humerus. While both men concluded that these tumours were evidence of malignant cancer of the bone, other specialists were more reticent in supporting the contention.

One further inference to the existence of cancer in Egypt is to be found in a papyrus discovered by Sir Flinders Petrie in 1898 during the course of excavation at Kahun - a city which was destroyed in 2100 B.C. As far as is known, the papyrus is the earliest known textbook of gynaecology for it deals exclusively with women's disease and other physiological changes which take place. In the midst of descriptions of maladies of the legs, possibly phlebitis, there is a description of a disease which had interested modern medical men in that, in conjunction with a terse account of an abdominal malady, there is mention of a 'smell of roast' as a typical symptom. Modern specialists, because of this statement and their own modern experience, were led to believe that this was an ancient report of abdominal cancer.

Early Pharmacopoeia

While men today generally refer to the Greeks, Hippocrates and Herophilus and the Greco-Roman Clarrisimus Galen as the fathers of modern medicine, the papyri of ancient Egypt have another story to tell. Georg Ebers, a nineteenth century German professor, was offered a sixty-five foot scroll by an Arab who claimed to have found it between the legs of a well-preserved mummy. Not particularly impressed by the Arab's story, the professor was reluctant to purchase the scroll. Glancing through what appeared to be a text full of unintelligible words, Ebers turned to the introductory lines which stated: **"Here begins the book on the preparation of medicines for all parts of the human body . . ."** The translation of the full text appeared in 1937 and was completed by the Danish Egyptologist, Bendix Ebbell who pronounced that the Eber's Papyrus was merely a copy of a far older

textbook of surgery as well as internal medicine. The Edwin Smith Papyrus - a fifteen and a half foot long work which was found in a tomb at Thebes - was purchased by the American Edwin Smith who, having made his purchase, made no attempt to decipher the text. It remained for the noted James Henry Breasted, the theologian-cum-Egyptologist to translate the work which proved that some three thousand years before the noted William Harvey propounded his thesis on blood circulation, Egyptian doctors - for one must call them as such - were conversant with the circulation of blood through the body. The Edwin Smith Papyrus clearly indicates that the Egyptians not only observed the heart-beat in a patient, but related the pulse rate to the heart. Without apologising for what might appear to be a dry recapitulation of the ill-health of a people long since dead, it should be noted that the pharmacopoeia in existence since then, plus the work of doctors and the record of their endeavours - all this indicates a society which suffered diseases, and disease required action and cost money. The situation today is no different and the Anglo-Saxon people are passing through exactly the same circumstances as did those people in ancient Egypt. Is this not precisely what the Lord said would happen if His people did not obey His Laws? The parallel is too striking for any to miss. Would it not be a 'good' of immeasurable dimension if the plague of ill-health and disease could be removed and the people freed from the ever present worry of both the effect of sickness and its cost. It can be done - what is more, it will be done.

GOD'S LAWS A SAFEGUARD AGAINST ILL-HEALTH

In reconsidering the subject of the 'diseases of Egypt' it will be found that the Bible uses the phrase in a context other than that of food and diet. It will be noted that in Deuteronomy 7:15 where it occurs, the context (verses 1-8) is the prohibition against making covenants with the numerically superior seven nations in Canaan as well as the stringent warnings against intermarriage with them. In Deuteronomy 28:60 where it is again used, the context is the whole body of related Law with particular reference to relationships between Israel and other people. In an age wherein universalism or equalitarianism is the order of the day, this subject will naturally be most unpopular with 'do-gooders' not only resenting it, but rejecting it outright as 'unchristian' and 'inhuman'. The point of issue here, however, is not whether it is unchristian or inhuman, but whether or not it is what the Lord God has to say. How many times are the prophets of the Lord exhorted to say to God's people; 'Hear the word of the Lord'? Is this not an indication that His people had and have the peculiar predisposition toward superimposing their own concepts, their own interpretation of subjects over what God has to say about them? It is small wonder that Anglo-Saxondom today, as the modern development of true Israel is so willing to lend an ear to the doctrine of antinomianism i.e., the non-validity of God's Law. In the keeping of God's Law, Deuteronomy 28:13 states: *"And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if that thou harken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I (Moses) command thee this day, to observe and to do them"*.

Failure to implement the Law which governs the whole spectrum of national life including the international relationships, would, according to the Lord, reverse the order of things with the 'stranger' dominating the scene.

"The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low. He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him: he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail" (Deut. 28:43-44).

This is precisely what has happened within the Anglo-Saxon company of nations today, for their whole economy is directed towards accommodating the 'stranger' who calls the national tune by invoking the mythical world opinion in support of his claims to 'human rights'. This is the context in which Deuteronomy 28 uses the phrase, the '**disease of Egypt**' a situation which suggest that these were and are the by-product of indiscriminate immigration into Israel lands.

Racial Pathology

It behoves all of us who are truly seeking to know the truth as revealed in God's Word to investigate all avenues and not to be 'switched off' when research comes up with facts which are not in accord with popular opinion. Take for instance, the above quoted Scripture which suggests that the subject of the diseases of Egypt have a positive association with the breakdown in Law-observance in the context of national relationships. Many would tend towards the opinion that the prohibition against the free integration of people was motivated by religious considerations and yet, no one could honestly contend that the disease of Egypt

were anything else but a physiological subject. There must, of necessity, be something more to it than that. There are several genetic works available to the general public all of which intimate wide physiological disparity between the races of men. For instance, *'Biology of the Negro'* by Lewis, indicates racial differences in response to drugs with the Negro appearing to be less susceptible to the central action of atropine than does the White. On the other hand, the Negro is more susceptible to the actions of anodynes, sedatives and hypnotics. In *'Racial Differences in Mydriatic Action of Cocaine'*, Chen and Poth have discovered that the pupil-dilating action or mydriatic action of cocaine, euphthalmine and ephedrine upon the eyes of Whites is very much greater than upon the eyes of Chinese and Negroes. The pupils of the Whites were dilated by these drugs more than three times as much as those of the Chinese and the dilation in the case of Chinese was more than twice as much as in Negroes. If all men are equal, why are there these differences? In terms of racial pathology and depending upon ideological persuasion, many geneticists cloud the issues by explaining the results of their investigations in terms of environmental factors. It is contended that the difficulty in interpreting the established differences in the incidence of disease, the gravity of their effects and the death rates resulting from these lies in the environments of the races compared. It is suggested that in the United States for example, the condition of sanitation, housing, nutrition and almost every other environmental factor that might influence the infection by disease and recovery from them, are greatly inferior for the Negroes to those employed by the whites. However, such a suggestion appears to be without too much credence for in *'Biology of the Negro'* quoted above, it has been established that whether in the United States or in Africa, tuberculosis is a much more serious disease among Negroes than among Whites. In the United States, the mortality from this disease is five times as high in Negroes and begins actively at a much earlier age than in Whites. Among the causes of death, tuberculosis is second in the Negroes, while statistics reveal that it is seventh among the Whites. In the case of American Indians, the proportion of deaths from tuberculosis of the respiratory system is more than four times the White rate and about twice the Negro rate. In *'Up from the Ape'*, Professor E.A. Hooton indicates that research has established a predisposition of the Negro to venereal disease - a contact-contagious disease which is easily discernible in the males but less so in the females. Journalists of all sorts in Anglo-Saxondom are now indicating that the incidence of venereal disease is on the increase and unlike many of the depressing tales that are alone thought newsworthy, this one is true. However, few appear to link this increase with the new morality which takes no cognisance of racial barriers. Probably the clearest example of almost complete racial segregation in disease is sickle cell anaemia to which Negroes are especially liable and to which Whites are immune. In his work, Lewis states that it is doubtful if there is a single genuine instance of sickle cell anaemia among Whites - the only exception being those with either a remote or recent infusion of Negro blood. In sickle cell anaemia, a defect in the intricate chemical structure of haemoglobin reduces the oxygen supply to the red blood cells which then assume a crescent shape from which the term 'sickle cell' derives its name. These cells are destroyed by the body resulting in chronic anaemia. If one parent has the sickle cell trait, a child born would stand a reasonable chance of survival with intensive medical care but, if on the other hand both parents are carriers, the child will have nothing but sickle cells and will not survive beyond adolescence. This is definitely an inherited condition and is limited only to Negroes or those of part Negro parentage. The point to note here is that sickle cell anaemia is exclusive to the Negro whether he be born in the United States, Britain or Africa. Leaving racial pathology as it concerns and is contrasted between the Negro and the White race, attention is now focused on the Mediterranean people whose genetic inheritance appears to be a disease known as thalassaemia which is also known as Cooley's anaemia and appears exclusively among Italians and Greeks. Much like the sickle cell anaemia among Negroes, this disease is a genetic defect in the formation of haemoglobin.

Research has established that this disease is found in both Italians and Greeks regardless of where they live and occurs in two degrees of severity categorised as major and minor. In the case of the former - presumably where both parents have inherited the disease - the end is fatal anaemia which does not allow its victim into adult life while the minor degree is only helped by the removal of the spleen and blood transfusions. It makes absolutely no difference where a person lives, his occupation or station in life. A genetic inheritance remains with him and is passed on to his children irrespective of his environment or the platitudinous preaching of 'social scientists'. **The Ashkenazim Jew for instance, whether living in Eastern Europe, the state of Israel or the United States, is the exclusive carrier of Tay Sachs disease.** This disease is so named after the British ophthalmologist Waren Tay who first described the visual problems associated with it in 1881 and the New York neurologist Bernard Sachs who published the clinical description some six years later. Because of its exclusiveness, this disease has become known as the '**Jewish Disease**' and is one of six others usually associated with the Jews. The National Foundation for Jewish Genetic Disease listed the six Jewish genetic disorders as (1) Tay Sachs; (2) Gaucher's disease, an inherited bone cartilage and liver defect; (3) Dysautonomia, a severe nervous system disorder; (4) Niemann-Pick disease, which kills during childhood in most cases; (5) Bloom's syndrome, which causes dwarfism; (6) a form of dystonia or severe distortion of limbs, neck and trunk. The seventh disease is a combination of mental retardation and eye disease called mucopolysaccharidosis IV and, like the other six is peculiar to the Ashkenazim Jews alone. While all seven are prevalent, Tay Sachs is the most common and usually strikes at roughly the age of six months. The child begins to lose weight and energy very rapidly, lying in bed for hours on end without changing position. This is followed by deformation of the chest, loss of vision with the circumference of the head increasing accompanied by brain deterioration. The child usually dies within months, although some linger on until they are four or five. Medical researchers have known for some time that the apparent cause of this disease is an accumulation of fatty substances that obstruct the central nervous system causing blindness, paralysis, convulsions and mental retardation which generally precedes death. Geneticists at the University of California at San Diego discovered that the cause for this condition was the absence of an enzyme called hexosaminidase - a discovery which initiated a screening programme in which prospective marriage partners could determine whether or not either had this disease. Dr. Michael Kaback, an associate professor in the School of Medicine at the University of California at Los Angeles, contends that a child with Tay Sachs disease would cost between a hundred thousand and a hundred and fifty thousand dollars during the four or five years he lives. With so much research taking place and establishing racial criteria in terms of disease, one feature emerges which is overlooked by most people and that is that within the Anglo-Saxon company of nations, no racially inherited disease characterises these people as it does others. This is not to say that they do not die from disease, but in the long lists currently available detailing the statistics and causes of death, no pattern of inherited disease is discernible. Heart diseases, Cancer, Strokes, Pneumonia, Diabetes, Mellitus, Cirrhosis of the liver, Arteriosclerosis and a host of other causes are there, but none can be established as being peculiar to Anglo-Saxondom. What has become a problem are the imported diseases which are transmitted by the carriers from other parts of the world who are permitted, through the immigration policies extant in Britain for instance, to flood the country. The United States policy of opening its doors to twenty five thousand Indo-Chinese per year could be an additive to the already grave problem.

The Spread of Disease

The 'Encyclopaedia Britannic' has a highly informative account of the spread of disease throughout the world in which it states: **"Transmission of disease by infected persons over longer or shorter distances, and from one country and people to another, is an established fact"**. The account continues by debunking the theory of climatic and environmental causes for the origin and spread of disease and although reticent in suggesting genetic origins for this, infers that this is the case. If one were to consider leprosy which many believe to be under control, but which according to the 1977 edition of 'Pears Medical Encyclopaedia' is now becoming evident in Iceland, one would find that the spread of this disease appears to be compatible with the migration of people from leprosy-dominated areas. Professor Gayre in *'Ethnological Elements of Africa'*, may provide a clue to this situation for he writes: **"Leprosy is a scourge in Ghana as elsewhere in Africa and Asia. I have more than once referred to a probable genetic basis to be the incidence of this disease. If it is genetic it is likely to have a racial relationship"**. The 'Encyclopaedia Britannica' appears to corroborate this in that it contends that intermarriage between carriers is the major problem in the extension of this disease for, contrary to popular belief, leprosy is not as infectious as most people conceive. There is very little danger of contracting this disease even in a leper colony, provided that intimate personal contact is avoided. How then, one asks, is this disease making its appearance in a climatically unfavourable country such as Iceland? As with leprosy, so with other former exclusively tropical diseases such as bilharzia mentioned previously. This disease - one of the diseases of ancient Egypt - requires a host carrier in order to spread from its tropical homes in Africa, South America and the East. Its appearance in the colder regions of Anglo-Saxon lands - as with the appearance of leprosy in Iceland - would relate to the degree of immigration of people from Africa, South America and the East into those countries. Malaria, another spreading disease which flourishes in tropical and sub-tropical countries, is adding to the health burden of Anglo-Saxondom. "Kill the mosquito and you will kill malaria" has been the dominant cry of most people involved in combating this disease and yet, according to a Report of the Malaria Commission of the Health Organisation of the late League of Nations, the belief in the causation of malaria by the Anopheles mosquito has been a big obstacle in the control of the disease. In point of fact, if one examines the life cycle of the malarial parasite, the human host is found to be indispensable to its continuity. The mosquito bites an individual and introduces into his blood sporozoites, small fusiform cells with one nucleus. They have to find their way into the liver within one hour or they die - those who do manage to find the liver, grow there and reproduce. After a week, the parasites leave the liver as merozoites which pass into the blood and invade the red corpuscles where they start cycles of growth and reproduction. When the merozoite enters the red blood corpuscle, it takes the form of a ring and within a few hours, fills the cell completely. Fission of the parasite takes place and each one gives origin to 16 daughter cells which, in turn are liberated into the blood out of the red cells in which they developed and the asexual reproduction cycle starts again as they penetrate new blood corpuscles. The periodic attacks of fever characteristic of malaria coincide with the liberation of the daughter merozoites into the blood stream. While the asexual merozoites start the reproductive cycle in the blood stream, sexual forms of the parasite begin to appear in the blood which can only survive and reproduce in a mosquito and if one comes along and bites the infected person, the merozoites pass into the stomach of the mosquito where both sexes join to produce a zygote which pushes its way out of the stomach. An oocyst is formed on the outside of the stomach within which many sporozoites develop and which, when fully grown, travel through the mosquito into its salivary glands from whence they hope to pass into another person when the mosquito bites him. From this it is apparent that humans are carriers and that the malaria disease can be transported from one part of the world to the other affecting people whose resistance to it is absolutely nil. It is small wonder therefore that the Lord God was so

emphatic in His Law concerning the structure of international relationships. If one considers His command to Israel in respect of the seven nations of Canaan (Deut. 7:1) in which he demanded total destruction, many are inclined to feel that there was no justification for the order. On the surface this would appear to be the case, but when one studies the 'abominations of the Canaanites' so often referred to by the prophets and exposed through the science of archaeology, one is able to appreciate some of the reason behind such a demand by the Lord. It is only since scientific investigation into the Canaanite way of life that so much has come to light, that men are able to appreciate something of the enormity of the immorality and ill-health which dominated the then Palestinian scene. Philo of Byblos, a Phoenician scholar who lived a hundred years before the Birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, wrote a history of the whole Mediterranean coast land as this was populated by the Canaanites. His authority for earlier descriptions was the priest Sanchuniathon whose writings exposed the total depravity - both temporal and spiritual - of the people. Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine discovered the writings of Philo and in A.D. 314 gave an account of them. The details were so shocking that people refused to believe him much in the same way that people today will refuse to believe the reason behind the Lord's restrictive structure concerning international relationships. The Canaanites were a disease ridden, depraved people whose history has been preserved on cylinder-seals which provide modern knowledge of perhaps the most perverted people in recorded human history. R. Labat in his *'Traite akkadien de diagnostics et prognostics medicaux'*, has provided an excellent insight into the diseases of Canaan which number, among others, Tuberculosis, Jaundice, Volvulus, Haemorrhoids, Strokes, Gonorrhoea, Kidney and Bladder maladies, Poliomyelitis, Cancer and Smallpox. The contention expressed concerning these disease has been derived from medical cuneiform texts which have survived the ravages of time to the present day. Medical historians in attempting to discover what diseases afflicted the people of Canaan and indeed the whole of Mesopotamia were at a distinct disadvantage to their colleagues in Egypt. The graves, unlike those in Egypt, contained no mummies and being less dry than Egypt, did not favour either the natural mummification of corpses or the preservation of skeletons. Archaeologists who spent considerable time excavating the region had no doubt that it was a hotbed of epidemics and infectious diseases of all kinds. Even today, after the lapse of so many centuries, plague, leprosy, malaria, smallpox, cholera, dysentery, infectious hepatitis, ophthalmia and a host of other diseases still obtain. Is it any wonder that the Lord demanded the eradication of these people and is it any wonder that He prescribed a diet for His people which would ensure that their resistance was more than equal to the erosion of the diseases current in the land? Make no mistake here. Diet is imperative if the natural resistance within the body is to withstand the onslaught of disease, whether carried by humans or derived from other sources.

GOD'S DIETARY LAWS

One has become very familiar with the antinomianist's (God's Law no longer valid) selection of isolated passages in the Gospel accounts to support their contention that the dietary laws incorporated in God's Law given at Sinai were considered of none effect by the Lord Jesus Christ. They cite the verse in Matthew 15 in which the Lord said: *"Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man"*.

It should be noted that as with Acts 10 and Peter's vision of the great sheet, the context reveals that it has nothing whatsoever to do with God's Dietary Laws. In the first instance, the Lord reacting to the charge leveled at His disciples by the scribes and the Pharisees who asked: *"Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread"* (Matt. 15:2).

The Lord answered this by indicating that they (the Jews) had perverted the Law of God to accommodate their own ways and in practise, they had made the 'commandment of God of none effect'. It will be noted that there is no mention of the food laws - merely the so-called transgressions of the method of eating.

In considering Peter and the vision of the great sheet *"Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things and fowls of the air . . ."* (Acts. 10:12), it should be noted that the overall context reveals that the chapter deals with human relationships and not food. In the first instance, ***'Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band'*** was one of the main actors of this drama while Peter's reluctance to entertain him was the main theme of it. The lesson, for Peter, in the whole exercise is summed up in two verses which positively indicate that the sheet was allegory and that *" . . . God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean"* (Acts. 10:28). In another verse i.e. the 34th, Peter avers: *"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons"* or more literally: *"Of a truth I perceive that God shows no partiality to outward appearance"*.

Cornelius, it will be recalled was outwardly a Roman - indeed a centurion in the service of Rome. As such, Peter resisted any association with him but was shown by the Lord that outward appearances were deceiving and that he should not reject the man on the grounds of his Roman citizenship. In point of fact, if one considers the name Cornelius, it will be found to contain a combination of Greek and Latin words which mean 'the horn (Cornu) of Levi (lius)'. Dr. James Strong in his Concordance intimates that the word "speira" which has been translated as 'band' in Acts 1:1 contains, by analogy, the meaning of 'a squad of Levitical janitors'. Be that as it may, one thing is very definite and that is that the vision of the sheet in no way abrogates the food laws of the Bible for Peter, it will be noted, despite the command to 'kill and eat', did not do so nor was he reprimanded for non-compliance The Law of the Lord - Food.

"This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature that moveth in the waters, and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth: To make a

difference between the unclean and the clean, and between the beast that may be eaten, and the beast that may not be eaten” (Lev. 11:46-47).

To insist that there are foods which can be eaten and food that cannot be eaten invariably invokes the retort that one is not a Jew, therefore not obliged to adhere to the Law or that one should not be a ‘food faddist’ as all foods are hygienically killed and prepared today. To these retorts, one is tempted to question men’s analysis of the situation against the Wisdom of God. In considering the ‘food-faddist’ charge, one finds that those who are most vociferous in leveling this charge at those who keep the food Laws of the Bible, are in the forefront of those campaigning for the replacement of butter by polyunsaturated margarine in an effort to ward off the high incidence of heart disease created by the high level of blood cholesterol. It is no exaggeration to say that the word ‘cholesterol’ has made margarine a best seller today - so much so that those who recoil from so-called food-faddism find themselves among the greatest advocates of margarine as the dietary defence against the early development of coronary heart disease. Vested interests, with its tremendous influence through the media, has it that the amount of cholesterol in the blood is dictated by the amount of saturated fat and cholesterol in the diet and by way of emphasis, illustrations are drawn from the developing countries of Asia where the diet is mainly whole grain foods which have a high fibre content and where heart disease is a rare occurrence. While no rational person is prepared to argue against proven fact, they are surely permitted to present other evidence which invalidates the interpretation of fact by the advocates of polyunsaturated margarine. In Kenya, for instance where the African tribes live on cow’s milk and meat and where animal fats supply approximately 60 per cent of the total calorie intake, cholesterol levels are about half of those in the United States and heart disease is almost unheard of. A further example could be the farmers in the Swiss Alps who live primarily on dairy products, yet they too have low blood cholesterol and rarely die of heart disease. Make no mistake here. No one is disputing the fact that elevated blood cholesterol is a fact of life for approximately 29 per cent of men over the age of 40, nor the fact that a rigid diet could reduce the level by 10 to 15 per cent. The point to note here is that once the diet has been discontinued, the previous level once again obtains and the afflicted person is in precisely the same situation as at the commencement of the diet. Dr. George Mann of the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine has said in this context: “Foundations, scientists and the media, both lay and scientific, have promoted the low-fat, low cholesterol polyunsaturated diets, yet the incidence of heart disease continues unabated, cholesteremia in the population is unchanged, and the clinicians are unconvinced of efficacy.” There can be absolutely no question when it comes to the facts of today when contrasted with the propaganda of vested interests in the food industry. In the United States alone, evidence shows a doubling of polyunsaturated fat intake since 1900 with little or no change in the intake of saturated fat or cholesterol. Despite this trend, coronary heart disease continues to rise - why? Another question which crops up, but which cannot be answered here is, is there any relationship between the increased use of polyunsaturated fats and the hormonal imbalance which is more than a little evident in the younger generation? If these questions are castigated as food-faddism - lets have more food-faddism! The United Nations Organisation, over recent years, has expressed concern over the population explosion and last month, i.e. June 1978, (as at the time of the writing of this article), warned that the two and a half per cent increase in the Black population of Africa was placing a strain on food production. Without commenting in the implications behind this concern - UNO has its own axe to grind when expressing ‘concern’ - it is a fact that the world’s food supply is certainly acute and what there is of it is basically artificial and is, to a large degree, reacting injuriously on the human organism. Dr. Frederick L. Hoffman who was connected with the Prudential Insurance Company of America and with the Biochemical Foundation of the Franklin

Institute of Philadelphia, in appraising the situation of an increased world population in relation to the available food supply, made the following observation in the context of chemical fertiliser as the means of stimulating crop production. "As the result of the introduction of chemical fertilisers, there has been a marked increase on crop production. The average amount of wheat in bushels per acre has increased from 9.9 in 1886 to 27.3 in 1958. The relative yield per acre varies, of course, widely for different sections of the country, having been as high as 28 bushels in Arizona and as low as 5.3 bushels in North Dakota . . . Everywhere efforts are made to increase the yield per acre, but what the effect this hazard is on the mineral or vitamin content of the food is not revealed." Having resorted to chemical fertilisers on order to boost crop yields, men have not looked at the cost - not so much to humanity today, but to future generations. In the book 'The Rape of the Earth' by Jacks and Whyte, the following extract is a tremendous indictment against the current trends. "The country which has received most attention in this connection is the U.S.A. and deservedly so, for America as usual is out for records. Alarming statistics can be quoted endlessly. On 56.4 per cent of the land surface of the U.S.A. a quarter or more of the soil has been lost. The total loss of fertility has been estimated at 30 to 50 per cent of the total originally available. The amount of soil annually reaching the sea is between 500 and 1,000 million tons, representing 2,000 million dollars worth of plant food, or twenty-one times the amount annually removed in crops . . ." Against this picture, the late Dr. Alexis Carrel in his work 'Man the Unknown' observes: "Man is literally made from the dust of the earth. For this reason, his physiological and mental activities are profoundly influenced by the geological constitution of the country where he lives, by the nature of the animals and plants on which he feeds . . ." This is undoubtedly true and presents a sorry picture of the nutritional value of man's food when one thinks of the rape of the earth in the attempt to feed the earth's millions through forced crop yields.

Good Soil the Basis for Good Food

If one examines the Creation story, it will be found that the earth and all things in and on it were 'good'. The soil was good; the herb bearing seed was good; every tree was good and every thing that moved on the face of the earth was good - and all this without any endeavour by man. In verse five of the second chapter of the Bible it is stated: "*. . . and there was no man to till the ground*" which on the surface and in the light of present day developments, appears to suggest a careless disregard for the importance of the soil. Again on the surface the superficial reading of this verse would suggest that man became lazy and merely exploited the resources of the region of his domicile, moving to some other place when these were exhausted. However, when one examines the Hebrew text - particularly in regard to the word 'till' - it will be seen that, having been given the earth and all its resources, man ignored the basic principles of stewardship and responsibility. The Hebrew word 'abad' which has been translated as 'till' indicates service and is used extensively in the Law in the context of bond-service. Significantly the Adam of Genesis 2:7 was put 'into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it' - the word 'dress' being translated from the same Hebrew word 'abad' and the word 'keep' from the Hebrew 'shamar' which indicates to 'hedge, guard and protect' it. The overall emphasis in the early chapters of the Bible in the context of the soil revolves around responsibility although one is not told the formula by which this responsibility should be carried out. The absence of this formula should not be attributed to a lapse on the part of the Lord, but rather to man's editing of the Word of God - evidence of which is found in many Books of the Bible, particularly in the works of Ezekiel. In the first four verses of this Book it is more than a little obvious that passages are lost - due no doubt to man's mis-handling of the text and the omission of things which he considered as irrelevant to the overall narrative.

It is quite possible that the same situation obtained in connection with the opening verses of the Book of Genesis for without doubt some body of Law existed which was in operation and was acted upon by men. The Law, given at Sinai to the children of Israel was a codified version of that which was in operation at a very much earlier time. In this version, one may read of the Lord's stipulation concerning the land and the soil which is recorded in the Book of Leviticus.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses in mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep the sabbath unto the Lord, Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof, But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard. That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of the vine undressed: for it is a year of rest unto the land".

The sabbath of the land in the seventh year appears, on the surface of it, to have nothing going for it at all, but when one looks at it through the eyes of modern scientific technology, one is able to appreciate something of the wisdom behind the Lord's stipulation. The soil mantle which covers the land mass of the earth consists of three elements and is generally classified as (1) the solid rock: (2) the mineral matter derived from this rock and (3) the organic top soil which results from the decay of plant and animal matter. It has been estimated that the proportion of organic matter in the few inches of the earth's top soil is a bare 4 per cent when compared with the mineral component, but in this meagre percentage one finds not only the life source of all food, but a whole world of micro-organisms at work renewing the vitality from which man draws his food sustenance. Organisms which are so small that they are only visible under the microscope and others much larger such as the humble earth-worm - all combine to keep a perfect balance in the fertility of the soil. It has been said that the lowly earth-worm with its natural function of, among other features, preserving the moisture content of the soil, has determined the rise and fall of countless civilisations. Every civilisation, the Byzantine; the Phoenician or the Roman which has passed into history with its sad tale of political corruption and decay will, on a close examination, be found to be attributable to the destruction of the earth-worm. This may, at first glance, appear to be ridiculous, but think in terms of what today is the Sahara Desert and which was once 'the granary of the Roman Empire'! What causes a desert? Surely every schoolboy knows that it is the destruction of the organic constituent of the soil leaving only the minerals which, deprived of moisture, becomes granules as in the sands of the desert. It is the earth-worm, in conjunction with the other micro-organisms, which keeps the moisture content of the soil - a balance in nature which when abused by man, deprives him of his food which in turn creates political situations among the people who revolt against government opening the way for a new and virile people to take over. The Lord's command to His Israel people was that they should work the land for six years and then allow it to have a complete year's rest. However, then as now, the soil was cultivated seven years out of seven and in many instances using the same soil, two and even three crops per year were planted. In God's Law, the seventh year, which began in the Spring and continued through to the Spring of the next year, one finds that both the fruit and the leaves of the trees simply fell back to the earth where the world of micro-organisms took charge of this abundance of organic matter turning it once again into that vital force which ensured that the food grown would be highly nutritious and a benefit to those eating it.

Today however, the cry is for more and more food and any thought of allowing the land one year's respite is unthinkable. More and more artificial fertilisers are ploughed into the fields and as has been stated earlier, the rape of the earth is gaining in momentum. Food is being produced, but is it of the character and nature sufficient to provide for healthy bodies adequately defended against the ravages of disease which too are on the increase throughout the world? God's warning to His people in terms of Law violation is: *"And your strength shall spent in vain: for your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits. And if ye walk contrary unto me, and will not hearken unto me; I will bring seven times more plagues upon you, according to your sins . . ."* (Lev. 26:20-21).

Make no mistake here. The Law of the sabbath of the land is a Law the transgression of which is a sin. It matters not that men contend that the Law is no longer valid - God's people in Anglo-Saxondom are reaping the consequences of sin - a tragic testimony to the fallacy of religious reasoning which presumes to sit in judgment on God's Holy Word. The Food Itself

Comment has already been made on Dr. Carrel's work 'Man the Unknown' in which man insofar as his physiological and mental activities are concerned, are a by-product of the food which he eats. It goes without saying that if his food is poor - he is poor in health and general outlook. However, another dimension is added to the burden of man's health in that all things are considered as beneficial for his well-being. In today's menu, the more 'way out' a morsel, the more desirable it becomes irrespective of its effect on the human system. Take for instance 'escargot' - the snail, which is being consumed more and more in Anglo-Saxon countries in recent years than ever before. Some twenty years ago the eating of this slug was considered not only distasteful, but an aberration of the 'continental types'. Today however, every menu in Anglo-Saxondom offers this 'delicacy' which is consumed because it has become the vogue. It is interesting to note that in the Bible, while the snail is mentioned infrequently, its by-product by way of paints and dyes are often referred to. One finds that the Tent of the Testimony and the High Priest's garment were dyed with blue and purple and that in Numbers 15:38, the children of Israel were commanded to 'make them fringes in the borders of their garments . . . and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a ribband of blue' - in the original text, the colour blue is preceded by the word 'tekhelet' which is derived from the snail. These dyes were produced from a gland in the abdomen of the snail and because of the minuteness of the quantity, the dyes were extremely expensive. Another interesting point in the context of snails is that in the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 33:19 in which is recorded the blessing of the tribes by Moses, that Zebulun whose tribal allotment encroached upon the Sea of Galilee, would 'suck the abundance of the seas and the treasures hid in the sand'. In the English text the 'sephunei' has been omitted which has led to the loss of the meaning of Zebulun's role. Literally the text according to the Jewish Encyclopaedia was a call to Zebulun because the people were dependent upon the tribe for the 'sephunei' (the snail), because of the blue and purple dye derived from it. By way of further interest, the snail is considered 'unclean' and therefore not fit for human consumption in Leviticus 11:30 and 42. Drawn from the food laws in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14, the following is a general list of both clean and unclean animals. The clean animals which are considered as good for food are those which both chew the cud and part the hoof, among which are numbered the cow, ox, calf, sheep, goat, ibex, hart, gazelle, buffalo and antelope generally. The unclean animals which do not both chew the cud and part the hoof are found among the camels, the monkey, the hare, the porcupine, the weasel, the pig, the dog, the fox, the cat family, the horse in its family and the mouse. Clean birds are the chicken, turkey, pheasant, quail, goose, dove pigeon, guinea fowl, partridge and grouse. Unclean birds are eagles, herons, cranes, hawks, the crow, the vulture, the owl, the swan, the pelican, peacock,

cormorant, water hen, stork and ostrich. There are, of course, others that fall within these separate categories and which are determined by establishing whether or not they accord with the principles of clean or unclean food. The general attitude today is that as the environment of all animals has been improved, the prohibition against them has been removed and that all are now fit for human consumption. Let it be said at once that nowhere in the Bible is there any justification for this contention. That which was unfit, because of its peculiar physical structure in the Old Testament, is exactly the same today and the reason behind the prohibition in the context of food, remains identical. God's people today are indeed a pathetic reminder of the unhealthy consequences of departure from God's Holy Laws and the blame for this - the indictment against the perpetrators of this sad state - is clearly established by Ezekiel the prophet who wrote: *"Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shown difference between the unclean and the clean and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them"* (Ezek. 22:26).

The difference between the clean and the unclean is the difference between life and death, good and evil - a difference which God's people will come to know in a time not far removed from today.

WHY?

Many people today, in attempting to salve their conscience in the context of eating food specifically prohibited in the Bible, have, in addition to claiming exemption from the Law through grace, indicated that God's restrictions on certain animals were purely ceremonial and therefore invalid in the physical sense. Make no mistake here. The terms 'clean' and 'unclean' - Hebrew, 'taher' and 'tame' - while occurring in many instances in a ceremonial context, are not limited to that sphere and are positively applied to the dietary Laws which have absolutely nothing to do with religious considerations. Long before any ceremonial ritual had been provided, animals (Heb.: behemah: quadrupeds) and birds (Heb.: owph; those covered with feathers) were divided into either 'clean' and 'unclean' categories or, as the Hebrew text describes them, 'pure' or 'foul' departments. It is most interesting to note that these two categories only came into being as a result of the relationship between Adamic man and the animals in the context of food for in the creation of the whole animal kingdom; "*God saw that it was good*" (Gen. 1:25).

Whether or not the Adamic race was given a list of clean or unclean animals is not recorded nor does it suffice to contend that the antediluvian civilisation was a vegetarian one, therefore making such a list unnecessary. However, when one comes to the time of the Flood, Noah was first commanded to preserve two of every species and later, to increase the number of 'clean' animals to seven, while that of the 'unclean' was to remain at two. The point to note here is that while the Hebrew text uses the words 'taher' and 'tame' - clean and unclean - no further definition of the terms precedes this, leaving one to understand that the Adamic race either was or had become familiar with the implication of the terminology. As all animals are basically 'good' within their own spheres - this was the Benediction of the Lord after creation - in the context of Adamic man's relationship to them and within the framework of food, this relationship should be governed by God's knowledge of that which He created. Within the framework of this knowledge, the Lord said to Israel: "*These are the beasts which ye shall eat among all the beasts that are on the earth. Whatsoever parteth the hoof and is clovenfooted, and cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that shall ye eat. Nevertheless these shall ye not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof: as the camel, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you . . .*" (Lev. 11:2-7).

The identifying principles, so clearly set out in God's Holy Law, are totally rejected today by God's Covenant people who relish their breakfast of 'bacon and eggs' and who do not object to the increasing usage of pork products within their processed foods. To them, the 'ham' has been 'cured' and the pig has therefore been transposed, by modern technology, from an 'unclean' to a 'clean' food. One wonders if the advocates of the universal 'cleanliness' of all foods have ever taken the trouble to have a serious look at God's Word and to note that it contains more than just a prohibition against certain animals and that it states, in the case of swine: "*Of their flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch; they are unclean to you*" (Lev. 11:8).

Many, of course, will claim that the prohibition against even touching the carcass is going too far and yet, for some strange reason, abattoirs follow standard instructions in slaughter procedures which make sense out of the Lord's prohibition against even touching the carcass of the pig. Abattoir operators are not allowed to slaughter other animals after the slaughtering of pigs unless the abattoir has been completely scrubbed and all floors, ceilings and freezers used for pig carcasses completely disinfected. After this procedure has been followed, the abattoir must stand idle for 48 hours. While there may not be complete and universal unanimity on this procedure, the fact that it has been adopted in certain countries as a derivative from experience should cause many to rethink their prejudices about God's Law and to realise that man is the benefactor when he abides by the Lord's instructions. Abattoir procedures as elucidated above, while preventing contamination of other carcasses with that of the pig, does nothing for the consumer who buys his portion and apparently enjoys his meal, secure in the so-called assurance that all is well. One wonders what would happen if the gourmet realised precisely what he was eating and that the bacteria within the flesh of the pig - bacteria so essential to the animal's function of assimilating the world's refuse - is not destroyed, no matter how much technology may claim to 'cure' it. Within the canning process, it has been established that while some bacteria are destroyed by the heat, others come to life which actually thrive on excessive temperatures. In God's Law He categorically states: "*Of their (swine) flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcass shall ye not touch; they are unclean to you*", and as one studies the official reports of government agencies, one is able to appreciate the answer to the question "Why?" when projected into God's prohibitions in His Law. In the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farmers Bulletin No. 1787 which deals exclusively with the internal parasites of swine, it states that there are twelve different forms of organisms which should be considered when raising swine. They are (1) dysentery-producing protozoa, (2) coccidia, (3) tape worms, (4) pork bladder worms, (5) the hydatid, (6) roundworms, (7) the intestinal threadworm, (8) the thorn-headed worm, (9) nodular worm, (10) the swine kidney worm, (11) lug worms, (12) trichina. In considering number 12, i.e. trichina or trichinella spiralis, these are slender threadworms occurring as adults in the small intestine of swine, in the blood as migrating larvae and in the muscles as encysted or encapsulated worms. The adult worm in the small intestines are from one-sixteenth to one-sixth of an inch long and about as wide as a very fine thread; the migrating worms in the blood are microscopic in size while those in the muscles are spirally rolled and are about one twenty-fifth of an inch long. The life history of trichinella spiralis is known and, as trichinosis in Anglo-Saxondom is on the increase as a result of the increased consumption of pig's flesh in opposition to God's Command, this history is now provided. The adult worms in the intestine are rather short-lived, but before they die and pass out with the droppings, the females produce numerous young worms which are deposited directly in the lymph spaces in the walls of the intestine. From the lymph channels, the worms reach the large blood vessels leading to the heart itself and the blood vessels leaving the heart, and are carried, by the blood, to all parts of the body. When the young worms in the bloodstream reach the muscles, they penetrate the muscle fibres and grow at the expense of the muscle tissue. After approximately three weeks, the young worms have attained their maximum size, having become spirally coiled with a thin membrane or cyst measuring roughly one-fiftieth of an inch forming around each worm. The worm is thus trapped in the muscles and cannot undergo any further development until the muscle tissue in which it is lodged is eaten. It is estimated that pigs acquire trichinae as a result of eating scraps of pork containing the encysted worms, or as a result of eating dead pigs, dogs, cats, rats or mice. Rats and mice become infested as a result of eating scraps of infested pork or each other. Human beings, so claims the report, become infested with trichinae as 'the result of eating raw or imperfectly cooked pork infested with these parasites'. Dr. Thomas Parran, former Surgeon General of

the U.S. Public Health Service, estimated that sixteen million persons in the United States are currently infected with trichinosis and that some fifty other diseased conditions of the human body are the direct result of contracting trichinella spiralis. In 'Studies on Trichinosis', a United States Public Health Report issued in 1943, the insidious nature of trichinosis is reported in that of 222 cadavers studied, each had the worm and yet none had been correctly diagnosed. In the report it is stated that unknowingly, millions of Americans harbour in their muscle tissue the larvae of trichinella spiralis and this because vested interests use pork as an adulterant in meat products. In summing up, the Public Health Report concludes: "Of the total persons dying in the United States over the period of these surveys, one out of every six was infected with the trichina parasite."

There are, of course, many who hold that "God has said it; I have read it; I believe it", and who require nothing further than God's Law as the basis for their conduct. On the other hand there are those who take 1st Timothy 4:4-5 as their authority for eating all things.

"For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it is received with thanksgiving: For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer".

No doubt the infected persons referred to in the U.S. Public Health Report were of this persuasion and not even the report by Dr. Willard H. Wright, Chief of the U.S. Zoological laboratory would cause them to change their minds. In this report, Dr. Wright quoted the findings of others and is worthy of record here. "Dr. J.H. Kellogg, in his study, 'Scientific View of the Hog', shows that the hog is such a dangerous carrier of disease because the animal itself is diseased. The lungs of the hog are frequently filled with large numbers of tubercles; in seventy-five cases out of one hundred you will find the liver filled with abscesses; the diseased liver upon closer inspection will be found to contain sacs in which are living tapeworms. Dr. Kellogg then shows that the excess fat of the pig is not a natural or healthy condition, but results from the animal's inability to throw off impurities. Since the swine cannot throw off its poison, this accumulated venom circulates throughout the body of the swine bringing about a diseased carcass." This, of course, means nothing to those who live under the grand delusion of the time and who care little or nothing about the words of He Who rose from the dead and Who said: *"If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they be persuaded through one rose from the dead"* (Luke 16:31).

Meat - in General

While that which has been written above comes within the context of natural phenomena, i.e. God's prohibition against eating swine's flesh on the basis of His knowledge of its constituents, the Law advocating the eating of beasts which part the hoof, is clovenfooted and chews the cud, did not take into account modern technology which is currently turning food into insidious poison. Vested interests, in their corporate desire for more profits, have realised the impossibility of cattle (and pigs) to fatten any faster and have thus joined science and technology to convert meat into refuse. While not specifically in the context of meat, the principles behind God's warning recorded in Amos 8:4-6 is the same in that He condemns the exploiters who 'sell the refuse of the wheat' for profit.

In 1976, the U.S Department of Agriculture made a proposal that in the light of modern technology, the definition of 'meat' be widened to accommodate 'additives' not currently covered by the word. At that time the well-known 'hot-dog' already contained 20 per cent of pulverized bones and fat in their total weight and it was estimated that within two years, i.e.

in 1978 (twenty years ago from this year), sausages, hamburgers, all processed meat and all other sausages would be composed of this new definition of 'meat'. While reaction against this new concept halted the proposal, the implementation of the definition has not halted the pollution of food. From the information available it would appear that the 'new meat' was to be created from the bones and offal. After the removal of all flesh, the bones would be pulverised to which would be added the fat with 13 portions of the animal carcass not usually eaten by humans, but which formed the basis for cat and dog food. In the normal course of events it takes three to four years for cattle to be converted into beef, but with today's methods motivated by the demand for quick monetary returns, it takes between one and one and a half years to put beef on the table. According to a report in 'Spotlight', animals in the United States are fattened by a mixture of urea and carbohydrate added to a high protein diet while tests are conducted using substances such as trituated plastic, pulverised newsprint mixed with molasses, wood shavings or sawdust. Another method to achieve even quicker fattening in the animals is the changing of the metabolism of the animal with drugs such as a very high-powered sex hormone, the results of which, on the consumer, could be extremely dangerous. The meat of a sex hormone-fed animal appears to the casual observer to be tender and delicious, and yet contains all the elements which could produce a very sick people.

The use of antibiotics on animals destined for human consumption makes the fat in the meat white and hard instead of the yellowish soft appearance. The essential difference between the two should be noted, for the fat produced by the introduction of antibiotics contains quantities of cholesterol and which could create heart conditions in the habitual consumer of this type of meat. Just prior to selling a beast for the consumer's market, some producers inject them with enzymes extracted from pineapples and papayas or paw-paws to tenderise their meat and with other chemical products to make them retain liquid which they would otherwise eliminate in the normal biological process. In this manner, the beast's weight would be greater thus providing the producer with a greater financial return.

All this is as obtains in many places where scripturally permitted meat is for sale. It should be stated with all emphasis that while God's Law merely relates the clean and unclean kinds of animals which should and should not be eaten, the morality of the producers of 'clean' food should be governed by his obedience to the whole body of the Law which does not permit either exploitation of circumstance nor the adulteration of his calling as a food producer. The things that are therefore done in order to gain a quick return for invested capital which are detrimental to the health of the consumer as much as a violation of the Law as is the eating of swine's flesh.

Identity of 'Clean' Food

It is absolutely true that 'two wrongs do not make a right' and the fact that unscrupulous persons are polluting good food should not give rise to an attitude of capitulation in which God's People discard all that the Lord has commanded and eat all things. The Laws governing clean food still obtain notwithstanding the perversions of vested interests and it behoves each of God's Covenant People to be fully conversant with these. In Deuteronomy 14:1, Israel was instructed: *"Ye are the children of the Lord your God . . ."* and the subsequent instructions concerning the dietary laws were intended to make the people a worthy and healthy depiction of this status. The clean and unclean foods have distinguishing marks by which animals not mentioned in either Leviticus 11:1-8 and Deuteronomy 14:3-8 can be identified. In the case of clean mammals, these are they that must be herbivorous; and they should not have incisor or canine teeth; they must ruminant; they should have a stomach

of multiple compartments and should walk on two toes or be cloven-hoofed. All others not conforming with these criteria are classified as unclean. In verse 4 of Deuteronomy 14, the identification of the ox, sheep and the goat provides no problem, but as confusion may arise in identifying the animals in verse 5, each one will be dealt with separately. The 'hart' (Heb. Ayyal) is the deer generally classified as *cervus capreolus* and while now extinct in Palestine was found to inhabit Mt. Carmel until fifty or so years ago. The 'roe-buck' (Heb. Tsebi) is the gazelle, *gazella subgutturosa*, which, apart from being a clean animal, was noted for its beauty and speed of flight and is referred to in many symbolic passages. The 'fallow deer' (Heb. yachmur) is the antelope *bubalis boselaphus* which is depicted in many ancient drawings of hunting scenes. The 'wild goat' (Heb. Ako) is the type designated as *capra aegagrus* which even today inhabits the mountains of the Syrian desert and is also considered a close relative to the 'nubian ibex' (*capra nubiana*) which in Hebrew is written as the 'yael'. The 'pygarg' (Heb. Dishon) is the antelope *adax nasomaculatus* which at one time, freely roamed the land of Palestine, but which has since disappeared and is only to be found in East Africa. The 'wild ox' (Heb. to or teo) is the bison, *bison bonasus*, bones of which have been found in the Lebanon. The 'buffalo', although not mentioned in the list of clean foods, was used as such as verified by the accounts in Isaiah 1:11 under the Hebrew name 'meri' and translated simply as 'fed beasts' and under the same name in Amos 5:22, 2nd Samuel 6:13, and 1st Kings 1:19. The 'chamois' (Heb. zemer) appears to be the wild sheep (*ovis musimon*) or the oryx (*oryx algazel*). Some confusion appears to attend a positive identification here as authorities are still in the process of their investigations. The carnivorous animals are unclean and among those listed in the Bible although not specifically within the Law, are the lion (Heb. arye); the leopard (Heb. namer); the dog (Heb. keleb); the wolf (Heb. zeeb); the jackal (Heb. iyyim); the hyena (Heb. tzaboa); the fox (Heb. shual) and the bear (Heb. Dob).

"Nevertheless, these ye shall not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the coven hoof; as the camel, the hare, and the coney . . ." (Deut. 14:7).

The reason behind the prohibition in this instance appears to be that while they chew the cud, they have no cloven hoof and therefore are unclean. The 'hare' (Heb. arnebet) has been in the center of much controversy because of the Greek translation of the Hebrew into 'dasypoda' which means 'hairy-footed'. When the Septuagint was produced at the order of Ptolemy, the translators were in the difficult position of not offending the ruler whose mother's name was 'Arnabta' which, as is obvious, has a close affinity with the Hebrew 'arnebet' which means 'the hare'. Whichever way one may look at this, the hare and its associates which do not part the hoof are not good for food. The 'coney' (Heb. shaphan) is the hyrax, *procavia syriaca*, whose external and internal structure is so anomalous that it is classed in an order by itself, having an affinity with the cloven-hoofed animals on the one hand and to the animals possessing trunks on the other. As the Law specifies the coney as unclean, it falls within the category no matter what men say about it.

Clean Birds

It should be stated in the outset that in connection with birds, no distinguishing marks of cleanness or otherwise are provided in the Pentateuch. One is therefore left with accepting what the Law actually says leaving the subject at that. However, there are one or two pointers which provide the basis for further research and which the individual could follow up. For instance, among the birds which should not be eaten, one finds the statement: *" . . . And the pelican, and the gier eagle, and the cormorant, And the stork, and the heron after her kind and the lapwing and the bat . . ." (Deut. 14:18).*

In the English translation, most names are easily understood, but when one comes to the Hebrew text, one finds that instead of the names of the various species of birds, their main characteristics are recorded. For instance, the English name eagle is translated from the Hebrew 'nesher' which means literally to 'lacerate', and by implication covers the activity of the birds of prey. It was on this basis that the priesthood of the Old Testament ruled that all birds of prey were unclean. Attention is now drawn to Leviticus 11:18 and Deuteronomy 14:16 where the swan is referred to as unclean. The Hebrew word from which this has been translated is 'tanshemeth' which literally indicates a characteristic rather than a proper noun and means 'irascible' and has, in various places been translated as 'tree toad', 'mole', 'waterhen', 'ibis', 'swan' and 'heron'. As the context under consideration is birds, the tree toad and mole can be discarded thus leaving the waterhen, ibis, swan and the heron. These four belong to the family known as the 'Anatidae' which is the name generally applied to the web-footed species and as the heron is specifically mentioned in both Leviticus and Deuteronomy plus those 'after its kind', one can safely say and still be within the authority of the Law, that the Anatidae family comes under the prohibition as food. The duck, which many consider a delicacy, comes under this heading. Previously and under the generalisation of clean and unclean birds, the authority for which is 1st Kings 4:23 where Solomon, at the height of his wisdom, provided a feast which comprised, among other things, "Ten fat oxen, and twenty oxen out of the pastures, and an hundred of sheep, beside harts, and roebucks, and fallow deer and fatted fowl . . .", the fatted fowl is translated from the Hebrew 'barburim abusim' which rabbinic authorities identify as the white goose whose fat and lungs were also used for medicine. The prefix 'bar' means pure while 'barbara' in Arabic means 'to scream', this is the basis for this identification. However, while it would appear that the 'barburim abusim' was used for food, its association is only on the most flimsy of data and should be excluded.

The 'Creeping Things'

Of those creatures which are classified as creeping things, the weasel, the mouse, the tortoise after his kind, the ferret, the chameleon, the lizard, the snail and the mole are singled out as unclean. There is no difficulty in identification here for each type enumerated is an accurate translation from the various Hebrew words.

Sea Food

"These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters; whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them ye shall eat. And all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers of all that move in the waters, and of any living thing which is in the waters, they shall be an abomination unto you" (Lev. 11:9-10).

The criteria here is very straightforward, for anything in the waters which has fins and scales is good for food, while anything falling outside this, is not. The waters of the earth are a vast unknown despite man's much vaunted science and technology and within this sphere live animals who are being exploited to supplement the world's food supply. All and sundry are fished and presented in various ways as edible for human consumption. This is not what God said and while men may have a free choice as to his sea food, he has absolutely no choice when it comes to the by-product of that choice if it falls outside that which God declared as good for food. Shellfish are eagerly sought out today with oysters, crab meat, mussels, and crayfish highly prized as exquisite delicacies. The ominous warnings which appear in daily

newspapers are disregarded and men wonder why the general health of the nation is deteriorating and the need for larger hospitals is growing. Last month and in Australia, the people were warned against eating oysters - a warning which was followed by an all-clear signal in a Sydney newspaper which stated that Australians would be relieved to know that it was safe again to eat the oysters. An outbreak of food poisoning caused by eating oysters resulted in at least two thousand people being treated in hospital. The explanation was that the oysters had been harvested too soon after heavy rain had washed sewage into the rivers. The oysters were performing their natural function of cleaning up the mess - men were performing a lawless one by eating them. A dead and rotting carcass, washed down the rivers and into the sea soon disappears when the shrimp and other shellfish begin their task of cleaning up the oceans of the world and man, notwithstanding his demand for a healthier life and better environment, harvests the scavengers of the sea and devours them! It is small wonder that the world's ecology is shot to pieces and smaller wonder indeed that human society is demanding more and more by way of hospital facilities. Looking at the overall situation and knowing full well the gravity of this, men still ask for the reason behind it all. Why, in the light of present technology is there so much misery and suffering? Why, after all this time is human society in such a state of upheaval, chaos and anarchy? The answer is unbelievably simple - men have forgotten God Whose appointed witness nation wallows with the rest of mankind in the cesspool of its own choice. As always, God's Way is the way to recovery for He says: "*Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will you die, O house of Israel?*" (Ezek. 18:30-31).

* * * * *

This is the final message in this truly wonderful series on the Law of God.

Truly, the Law of God is perfect, converting the soul.

Truly has the prophet Isaiah stated:

"O that thou hadst obeyed My commandments. Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea".

How long are we, as individuals, and as a nation, going to continue to flout the righteous Laws, Commandments, Statutes, and Judgments of a loving God who desires nothing more for His people than the absolute best that He can give. We continue to disobey Him at our continuing peril. Our safety and health and well being in every avenue of our lives is assured only when we humble ourselves in total obedience to the One who loved us so much that He gave His life to redeem us from the curse of the law which through continued disobedience could, and would, have only one end - Misery and Death. He did not do this for us as a matter of favouritism. He did it because He loved us. He did this because for reasons which most of us find impossible to even begin to understand, He has foreordained us to be the instrument by which, and through which, He will bring hope, life, and joy, to all families and nations of the earth. We can only achieve this noblest of all purposes as we demonstrate through our example His Great Purposes for a sick and weary world. We dare not fail Him. Indeed, it is His Divinely stated intention that we will not fail Him. The prophet Isaiah assures us of this. May we, in the short time that remains for us, do our very best, in every way, and at every opportunity, to awaken our people to the fact that the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is still our God, and that, despite all our failings, we are still His people whom He has chosen to show forth His glory.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the LORD for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.”

“If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.”

**May we be led by the Spirit of God to obey Him in all things.
Only then can we expect His rich blessings.**

Frank W. Dowsett. Editor.

For more books by W.G. Finlay and other Christian Patriot authors, please visit:

<http://www.thechristianidentityforum.net/>